Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs

# Answers to Liturgical Questions

Volume One

# Answers to Liturgical Questions

## In Appreciation

Publication of this work was made possible
in part through the generosity of:

**John, Tina, and Emmanuel J. Melonakos, M.D.**

and

**FAITH: An Endowment for Orthodoxy and Hellenism**

We deeply appreciate and are grateful for their support.

# Answers to Liturgical Questions by Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs:

## A Complete and Annotated Translation

(Based on the 6th Edition of Apostolikē Diakonia)

Volume 1

Questions 1–150

General Editor and Translator
Patrick Viscuso

Associate Editors and Translators
John Margetis, Anton Vrame

Contributors
Patrick Viscuso,
John Margetis, Andreas Houpos, and Dionysios Papiris

HOLY CROSS
ORTHODOX PRESS
Brookline, Massachusetts

Published by Holy Cross Orthodox Press
Hellenic College, Inc.
50 Goddard Avenue Brookline, MA 02445
© Patrick Viscuso, John Margetis, and Anton Vrame, 2024

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise with the prior permission of Holy Cross Orthodox Press.

ISBN

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 978-1-935317-87-6 | 1-935317-87-3 | Vol 1 (hardcover) |
| 978-1-935317-93-7 | 1-935317-93-8 | SET |

The copyright holder of the books *Απαντήσεις εις λειτουργικάς απορίας* by Ioannis Foundoulis is Apostoliki Diakonia. This translation has been licensed by Apostoliki Diakonia for the First (1st Edition). All rights reserved.

Publisher's Cataloging-in-Publication Data
(Provided by Cassidy Cataloguing Services, Inc.)

| | |
|---|---|
| Names: | Phountoulēs, Iōannēs M., 1927-2007, author. \| Viscuso, Patrick, 1956- editor, translator. \| Margetis, John, editor, translator. \| Vrame, Anton C., editor, translator. \| Houpos, Andreas, contributor. \| Papiris, Dionysios, contributor. |
| Title: | Answers to liturgical questions by Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs : a complete and annotated translation / general editor and translator, Patrick Viscuso ; associate editors and translators: John Margetis, Anton Vrame ; contributors, Andreas Houpos and Dionysios Papiris. |
| Other titles: | Apantēseis eis leitourgikas aporias. English |
| Description: | First English edition. \| Brookline, Massachusetts : Holy Cross Orthodox Press, [2023] \| Translation of: Apantēseis eis leitourgikas aporias. \| Includes bibliographical references and index. |
| Identifiers: | ISBN: 978-1-935317-93-7 (set) \| 978-1-935317-87-6 (v. 1 hardbound) \| 978-0-916586-06-5 (v. 1 paperback) \| 978-1-935317-88-3 (v. 2 hardbound) \| 978-0-916586-19-5 (v. 2 paperback) \| 978-1-935317-89-0 (v. 3 hardbound) \| 978-0-916586-20-1 (v. 3 paperback) \| 978-1-935317-90-6 (v. 4 hardbound) \| 978-0-916586-22-5 (v. 4 paperback) \| 978-1-935317-91-3 (v. 5 hardbound) \| 978-0-916586-27-0 (v. 5 paperback) \| 978-1-935317-92-0 (v. 6 hardbound) \| 978-0-916586-28-7 (v. 6 paperback) |
| Subjects: | LCSH: Orthodox Eastern Church--Liturgy--History. \| Orthodox Eastern Church--Doctrines. \| Sacraments--Orthodox Eastern Church. \| Orthodox Eastern Church--Apologetic works. |
| Classification: | LCC: BX350.A5 V57 2023 \| DDC: 264/.019009--dc23 |

# CONTENTS

The Project of Translation and Expressions of Gratitude . . . . . vii

Abbreviations . . . . . x

Overview of the Translation . . . . . xv

Introduction by the Editors . . . . . xxi

The Liturgiologist Professor I. M. Phountoulēs:
His Personality and Work by Panagiotēs I. Skaltsēs. . . . . xxxvii

Translation of the Original Title Page . . . . . 1

Prologue to the First Edition . . . . . 4

Introduction by the Author . . . . . 6

Questions and Answers . . . . . 9

# The Project of Translation and Expressions of Gratitude

In 2019, the Very Rev. Dr. Patrick Viscuso initiated the project of translating the five volumes of the *Ἀπαντήσεις εἰς λειτουργικὰς ἀπορίας* of Iōannēs Phountoulēs with the formation of a small team that was invited to contribute initial translations. These contributing translators and their assignments included the Very Rev. Dr. Peter Chamberas (volume three), Very Rev. Fr. Andreas Houpos (volume three), Very Rev. Dr. Stelyios Muksuris (volume four), Very Rev. Fr. Patrick O'Grady (volume two), Very Rev. Adn. Dionysios Papiris (volume one), and Very Rev. Dr. Patrick Viscuso (volumes one, four, and five). During this beginning work, Fr. Houpos also contributed selected translations for volumes one, two, and three. Fr. Viscuso translated Phountoulēs's original prologue to the first volume and drafted a beginning list of liturgical terms, which were reviewed by the team members.

The general editor and translator Fr. Viscuso, and the associate editors and translators, John Margetis and His Grace Bishop Anthony of Synada, took over the project and substantially reviewed, standardized, edited, retranslated, and annotated the contributing translators' initial work, and produced a lexicon of major liturgical and technical terms.

The editors express their gratitude to the team members who contributed the initial translations, and the many individuals and institutions who supported the project. We are grateful to His Eminence Metropolitan Agathangelos of Fanarion, the General Director of Apostolikē Diakonia of the Orthodox Church of Greece for his assistance in obtaining permission for the translation of the volumes and His Eminence Metropolitan Theoklētos of Stagoi and Meteora for permission to reproduce photographs of important Byzantine

monuments in his metropolis. We thank the staffs of the Libraries of Zagora and Kozani; His Grace Bishop Joachim Cotsonis, Director of the Archbishop Iakovos Library and Learning Resource Center (Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology); and Julia Ritter, Curator and Librarian (Antiochian Heritage Museum and Library) for extending the resources of their respective institutions. It would be impossible to list all the individuals who supported our work. We especially thank the Very Rev. Dr. Stefanos Alexopoulos; the Very Rev. Demetrios Antokas; Dr. Roland Betancourt; Marina Blair; the Very Rev. Dr. Alkiviadis C. Calivas; George M. Cantonis, former President of Hellenic College and Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology; Jack Figel of Eastern Christian Publications; the Rev. Dr. Daniel Galadza; Dr. David Heith-Stade; Dr. Valerie A. Karras; Dr. Sr. Vassa Larin; Dr. Alexander Lingas; the Very Rev. Bartholomew Mercado; the Rev. Protod. Leonid Mickle; Dr. David Olster; the Very Rev. Iōannēs Palantzas, Abbot of Panagia Chrysinou Monastery (Kalambaka); Dr. Lewis J. Patsavos; the Very Rev. Constantine Pavlakos; the Very Rev. Maximos Pavlidis; the Very Rev. Victor Potapov; Dr. Despina D. Prassas; the Rev. Dr. Andrei Psarev; Dr. Panagiotēs I. Skaltsēs; the Very Rev. Dr. Robert Stephanopoulos; George Theodorides; and Dr. Andrey Vinogradov. We are thankful for our expert copy editor Dr. Stamatina McGrath and indexer Erika Zabinski. We also express our appreciation to our former indexer Dr. Kate Mertes, who passed away during her work on the first volume.

We acknowledge the extraordinary generosity of the Very Rev. Dr. Steven Hawkes-Teeples for permitting the extensive quotation of his translations of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki.

We are grateful for the spiritual blessings and prayers of His Eminence Archbishop Elpidophoros, Primate of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese; His Grace Bishop Maxim of Los Angeles and the Western American Diocese of the Serbian Orthodox Church; His Eminence Metropolitan Methodios of the Greek Orthodox Metropolis of Boston; His Grace Bishop Nikolai (Soraich) of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia; and His Grace Bishop Thomas of the Antiochian Orthodox Diocese of Oakland, Charleston, and

the Mid-Atlantic, and who has served as the hierarchical overseer of the Antiochian House of Studies.

We deeply appreciate and are grateful to John, Tina, and Dr. Emmanuel J. Melonakos, MD, and FAITH: An Endowment for Orthodoxy and Hellenism for substantially funding the publication of this work.

Fr. Viscuso is grateful to his wife Susan and son Sebastian for their many sacrifices that supported the project, and John Margetis, to his ancestors who retained their faith and traditions under adversities and persecution.

It is our hope that these questions and answers will benefit the clergy in their celebrations and ministries.

# Abbreviations

AASS—*Acta sanctorum quotquot toto orbe coluntur* (Antwerp: 1643).

ANF—A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Fathers Down to 325 A.D.*, 10 vols. (1885–1887; Repr., Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1989).

BDAG—Frederick W. Danker, Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

Benešević—Vladimir Benešević, "Отвѣты Петра Хартофилакса," Записки императорской академии наукъ, vol. VIII no. 14 St. Petersburg 1909.

Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins*—René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966).

Cambridge—J. Diggle, B. L. Fraser, P. James, O. B. Simkin, A. A. Thompson, S. J. Westripp, eds., *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021).

CPG—Maurice Geerard, ed., *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, 5 vols. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974–1987).

Dēmētrakos—Δημήτριος Δημητράκος, ed., *Μέγα λεξικὸν ὅλης τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης*, 15 vols (Ἀθῆναι: ἐκδόσεις Δόμη, 1964).

DOP—*Dumbarton Oaks Papers*.

Galadza—Daniel Galadza, *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

GCS—*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte.*

Goar, Εὐχολόγιον—J. Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον sive Rituale Græcorum complectens ritus et ordines Divinæ Liturgiæ, officiorum, sacramentorum, consecrationum, benedictionum, funerum, orationum, etc. cuilibet personae, statui vel tempori congruos, juxta usum Orientalis Ecclesiae... editio secunda expurgata, et accuratior* (Venice: Bartholomew Javarina, 1730).

Lampe—G. W. H. Lampe, ed., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).

Larin—Vassa Larin, *The Byzantine Hierarchical Divine Liturgy in Arsenij Suxanov's Proskinitawrij*, OCA 286 (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Orientale, 2010).

LBG—Erich Trapp, ed., *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität besonders des 9.-12. Jahrhunderts*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik VI/1-8 (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1994–2017).

*Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarchat de Constantinople—Les Regestes du Patriarcat de Constantinople (Le Patriarcat Byzantine, Série I)*: vol. 1, *Les Actes de Patriarches.* fasc, 1, *Les Regestes de 381 à 715*, by Venance Grumel, ed. Jean Darrouzès, 2nd ed. (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1972); vol. 1, fasc. 2-3, *Les Regestes de 715 à 1206*, by Venance Grumel, ed. Jean Darrouzès, 2nd ed. (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1989); vol. 1, fasc. 4, *Les Regestes de 1208 à 1309*, by Vitalien Laurent (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1971); vol. 1, fasc. 5, *Les Regestes de 1310 à 1376*, by Jean Darrouzès (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1977); vol. 1, fasc. 6, *Les Regestes de 1377 à 1410, by Jean Darrouzès* (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1979); vol. fasc. 7, *Les Regestes de 1410 à 1453*, by Jean Darrouzès (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1991). (References are to the documents, which are numbered in chronological order consecutively throughout).

LSJ—Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. with revised supplement (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).

Mansi—Giovanni Domenico Mansi, ed., *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio.*

Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1—Juan Mateos, ed. and trans., *Le Typicon de la Grande Église. Ms. Sainte-Croix no. 40, Xe siècle. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, Tome I, Le Cycle des Douze Mois*, OCA 165 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1962).

Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2—Juan Mateos, ed. and trans., *Le Typicon de la Grande Église. Ms. Sainte-Croix no. 40, Xe siècle. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, Tome II, Le Cycle des Fêtes Mobiles*, OCA 166 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1963).

NETS—Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

OCA—Orientalia Christiana Analecta.

OCD—Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, eds., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press).

OCP—*Orientalia Christiana Periodica.*

ODB—Alexander P. Kazhdan et al, eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium,* 3 vols. (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*—Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy,* 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

PG—J.-P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca,* 161 vols. in 166 pts. (Paris: 1857–1866).

RSV—Revised Standard Version.

Rhallēs and Potlēs—Γ.Α. Ῥάλλης καὶ Μ. Ποτλῆς, *Σύνταγμα θείων καὶ ἱερῶν Κανόνων τῶν τε Ἁγίων καὶ Πανευφήμων Ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν Οἰκουμενικῶν καὶ τοπικῶν Συνόδων καὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος Ἁγίων Πατέρων,* 6 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: Γ. Χαρτοφύλαξ, 1852–1859).

SC—Sources Chrétiennes.

Simmons, *St. Symeon*—Harry L.N. Simmons, trans., *St. Symeon of Thessalonike, Treatise on Prayer* (Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1984).

Sophocles—E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (From B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914).

Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*—Steven Hawkes-Teeples, ed. and trans., *St. Symeon of Thessalonika, The Liturgical Commentaries,* vol. 168 of *Studies and Texts* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2011).

*The History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law*—Wilfred Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington, eds., *The History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012).

Thomas and Hero—John Thomas and Angela Constantinides Hero, eds., *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents: A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments,* 5 vols. (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2000).

Tolika—Ὄλυμπία Τολικά, *Ἐπίτομο Ἐγκυκλοπαιδικὸ Λεξικὸ τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Μουσικῆς* (Ἀθῆναι: Εὐρωπαϊκὸ Κέντρο Τέχνης, 1993).

Woodfin—Warren T. Woodfin, *The Embodied Icon, Liturgical Vestments and Sacramental Power in Byzantium*, Oxford Studies in Byzantium (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Χρηστοήθεια τῶν χριστιανῶν*—Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Χρηστοήθεια τῶν χριστιανῶν: Περιέχουσα Λόγους ψυχωφελεστάτους δεκατρεῖς, ῥυθμίζοντας ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον τὰ κακὰ ἤθη τῶν Χριστιανῶν. Πρὸς δὲ, καὶ τὰς κυριωτέρας Ἐντολὰς τῆς Παλαιᾶς καὶ Νέας Διαθήκης* (*Morality for Christians: Containing thirteen Orations profiting the soul, which educate to improve the bad morals of Christians. And in addition, also the authoritative Commandments of the Old and New Testaments*) (Venice: Ἐν τῇ Τυπογραφίᾳ Νικολάου Γλυκὺ τοῦ ἐξ Ἰωαννίνων, 1803).

ΘΗΕ—*Θρησκευτικὴ καὶ Ἠθικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια*, 12 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: Ἀθαν. Μαρτίνος, 1962–1968).

ΜΕΕ—Παῦλος Δρανδάκης, ed., *Μεγάλη Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια*, 24 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: Πυρσός, 1927–1934).

Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυλογίας*—Α. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυλογίας*, 5 vols. (St. Petersburg: Β. Κιρσπάουμ, 1891–1898).

Σταυρινός, *Ἡ Ἱερολογία*—Ἀμβρόσιος Σταυρινός, *Ἡ Ἱερολογία τοῦ γάμου ἀπὸ τὰ τέλη τοῦ Θ΄ μέχρι τοῦ τέλους τοῦ ΙΣΤ΄ αἰώνος* (Κωνσταντινούπολη: Ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1923).

Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*—Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας*, Texte und Forschungen zur Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Philologie no. 15 (Ἀθῆναι: Ἡ ἐπιστημονικὴ ἐπιτροπὴ πρὸς ἀναθεώρησιν καὶ ἔκδοσιν τῶν λειτουργικῶν βιβλίων, 1935).

Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*—Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 2 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1950–1955).

Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей—А. А. Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, хранящихся въ библиотекахъ Православного Востока, 3 vols. (Киев: Г. Т. Корчакъ-Новицкаго, 1895–1917).

# Overview of the Translation

The following translation compromises the six hundred answers to liturgical questions by the liturgical scholar Iōannēs Phountoulēs. This project is not a new edition or reorganization of the five-volume work but strictly a translation of the existing text. The texts used for the translation were the editions of the volumes published by the Apostolikē Diakonia of the Church of Greece current at the beginning of 2019: Volume one – Questions 1–150 – sixth edition – 2006; Volume two – Questions 151–300 – fifth edition – 2006; Volume three – Questions 301–400 – fourth edition – 2006; Volume four – Questions 401–500 – second edition – 2006; and Volume five – Questions 501–600 – first edition – 2003. A comparison was later made with the sixth edition of volume two that was published in 2019. The textual differences are accounted for in the translation. Corrections and omissions in the original text are documented in footnotes.

At the end of each original Greek volume, there were individual tables of contents according to the material covered as well as analytical alphabetical indexes. However, consistent with the author's wishes expressed in the prologue to volume five, these were replaced by a general alphabetical index by subject to all five volumes. A newly created sixth volume contains this index and a glossary of major liturgical and theological terms that were not part of the Greek publication.

The aim of the translation is to convey the meaning of the Greek text in colloquial English. The approach used is academically disciplined to ensure consistency. Towards this end, a lexicon was developed for the consistent translation of major liturgical and theological terms as well as a list for the translated beginnings of standard Psalms, liturgical texts, and hymns. The American Library Association-Library of Congress (ALA-LC) Romanization scheme (2010) is used for the transliteration of Ancient, Patristic,

or Modern Greek. Romanization of names is generally done, but not for Gospel and Old Testament figures such as the four evangelists, the Forerunner, and so forth. Adjustments are made for Septuagint use. However, the name "James" is treated as a special case, with the Romanized Greek name following in this manner: "James (Iakōvos)." Certain other names follow a modified ALA-LC form based on popular usage in North America, for example, Saint Paraskevē versus Saint Paraskeuē, vaskania versus baskania, and evlogētaria versus eulogētaria.

Place names are left in their commonly used form without conformity in most cases to ALA-LC Romanization. Certain variations in Greek spellings of words are retained in transliteration, including antiminsion/antimēnsion, kolyba/kollyba, and Karyophylēs/Karyophyllēs.

A style sheet was developed, which is based on the *SBL Handbook*, 2nd edition, and the *Chicago Manual of Style*, 17th edition. In general, the style sheet and *SBL Handbook*, 2nd edition, are followed regarding capitalizations. Pronouns regarding the Deity are at times capitalized for clarity, but not consistently. Wherever both genders are implied in the Greek, an attempt was made to convey their inclusion in English (his/her, him/her, and so forth). The preciseness of the Greek language in the gender and number of pronouns at times required the repetition of certain nouns. Some terms are made plural by using their Greek form. Such pluralization is captured in the glossary. In some instances, the plural use is accompanied by an explanatory footnote.

Since so many foreign terms are used, italicization of them is not done. However, *Diataxis* as a book title is italicized. The service of the "typika" is lowercase, but the books of the Typika are capitalized. Certain words are capitalized such as the "Fast" when referring to the Great Lent, the numbered Sundays for gospel readings, gospel readings versus the Gospel book, and the "Fathers" of the Church versus the "fathers" (monks) of a monastery. Diataxis as a book or title is capitalized. In general, while terms referring to the Body and Blood of Christ are capitalized, sacraments outside of the Holy Eu-

charist and Liturgy are not capitalized. However, the names of certain specific services, such as Compline, Matins, Vespers, Great Hagiasmos, and so forth are capitalized. The "Christians" is capitalized (and is used in an equivalent sense to the English word "laity"). The Lord's Baptism and Crucifixion are capitalized. The term "Trisagion" is capitalized when referring to the service but lowercase when referring to the trisagion hymn.

Particular Greek words are handled in special ways dependent on context. The noun "εἶδος, τό" is variously translated as "species," "kind," "sort," "description," "form," "shape," and "style." The adjective "ἀδέσποτος, ή, όν" was translated as "stray," "masterless," "ownerless," "derelict," "abandoned," "without master," "without owner," and "not under the control of." The adjective "δόκιμος, ή, όν" is a special case in that the definition of the word is not solidified across Modern Greek – English lexica and no "tested" definition appears to be settled upon. As in the case of other terms, the word was translated contextually but with the overall concepts of "passing the test," "hitting the mark," "reliability," "standing the test of time," "appropriate," "esteemed," "tried," "trustworthy," "trusted," "compatible," and so forth. The noun "γραφή, ή" was translated as "reading" when used in the context of a manuscript "reading" of a text (although in some cases, "λόγος" was translated as "reading," for example, in question 572). The verb "σχολάζω" was translated as "I am absent" (when used to describe the suspension of the Psalter's use). The noun "χοροστασία, ή" was rendered as "presiding outside the bēma"; and χοροστατέω as "I preside outside the bēma." The term, "κατάλυσις" is translated based on its contextual and idiomatic meaning, rather than its literal lexical sense. Consequently, "κατάλυσις εἰς πάντα" is translated as "consumption of everything" (namely, non-fasting), "κατάλυσις τυροῦ" as "consumption of dairy," and "κατάλυσις ἰχθύος" as "consumption of fish." The term has this meaning in ecclesiastical books such as the Mēnaia. The expressions, "τιμῶνται ἐπ' ὀνόματι" or "τιμᾶται ἐπ' ὀνόματι," followed by a saint's name or feast in the genitive and used regarding temples, are translated "they are dedicated in the name of" or "it is dedicated in the name of" respectively.

Although used in the nominative, genitive, and accusative cases, the term "kairos" is transliterated in the nominative case for consistency when referring to preparation for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy. The title, "εὐχὴ τοῦ καταπετάσματος," was translated "prayer of the curtain" based on Phountoulēs's discussion in question 600 regarding the prayer's meaning.

The following is a list of acknowledged variances contained in the translation:

| | |
|---|---|
| Ἄξιον ἐστίν . . . | It is truly meet |
| Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον | It is proper and right |
| Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον σὲ ὑμνεῖν . . . | It is proper and right to hymn you . . . |
| Ἄξιόν σε ἐν πᾶσι καιροῖς ὑμνεῖσθαι φωναῖς αἰσίαις . . . | It is proper at all times for you to be praised with fitting voices . . . |

Phountoulēs's work did not contain many footnotes: four notes in questions 61, 75, 111, and 118 in volume one, three notes in questions 175, 200, 299 in volume two, none in volume three, none in volume four, and none in volume five. An effort is made to provide references for all cited texts. In addition, the first use in an answer of a Scriptural, liturgical, and hymnological text is footnoted with its equivalent Greek. A brief biography of most major writers and theological figures is also provided in footnotes at their first reference in a volume. Footnotes are used to provide the full text of hymns as well as clarifying explanations, including cultural, historical, and liturgical contexts. In many cases, cross references are provided in footnotes at the beginning of answers.

Editions explicitly used by Phountoulēs are referenced, such as Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921) and Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874). In general, references in the text to specific works are verified and are added in footnotes. The Sources Chrétiennes edition is used for the liturgical commentary, *Ἑρμηνεία τῆς Θείας Λειτουργίας* (*Ex-*

*planation of the Divine Liturgy*), of Nikolaos Chamaetos Kabasilas (Νικόλαος Χαμαετὸς Καβάσιλας). The paragraph numbers of Kabasilas's work are given in the text consistent with the Sources Chrétiennes edition, which differs from those originally cited by Phountoulēs. In addition, the numbering of the works of Pseudo-Dionysios generally follows the editions of the *Patrologia Graeca*.

Translations of relevant works of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki are taken with permission from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, ed. and trans., *St. Symeon of Thessalonika, The Liturgical Commentaries*, vol. 168 of *Studies and Texts* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2011). Gratitude is expressed to the Greek Orthodox Metropolis of Denver Music Federation for providing a print copy of the translation of the Typikon of Violakēs by the Rev. Robert T. Athas.[1] However, rather than rely on the Athas version, a new independent translation of those quoted and cited portions of the Typikon was made to ensure consistency of language with Phountoulēs's overall work. For the present translation, the glossary of major liturgical and theological terms as well as the list of the translated beginnings of standard Psalms, liturgical texts, and hymns were also developed independently to ensure consistency. Additional explanatory footnotes were included in the translation of the article by Professor Panagiotēs I. Skaltsēs, "Ὁ Λειτουργιολόγος Καθηγητὴς Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης (1927-2007). Ἡ προσωπικότητα καὶ τὸ ἔργο του."[2] For the most part, the translation of Septuagint texts follows *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*,[3] while New Testament citations are based on the Revised Standard Version. In both cases, modifications including

1. George T. Demos, ed., *The Ritual Order of the Services of the Great Church of Christ, George Violakis – Bilingual Typikon* (Highlands Ranch, CO: Greek Orthodox Metropolis of Denver Music Federation, 2014).

2. Παναγιώτης Ἰ. Σκαλτσῆς and Νικόδημος Ἀ. Σκρέττας, eds., *Γηθόσυνον Σέβασμα. Ἀντίδωρον τιμῆς καὶ μνήμης εἰς τὸν μακαριστὸν καθηγητὴν τῆς Λειτουργικῆς Ἰωάννην Μ. Φουντούλην (+2007)*, (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδοτικὸς Οἶκος Ἀδελφῶν Κυριακίδη Α.Ε., 2013), 1:25–92.

3. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

verse numbering were made when deemed appropriate, for example, to be consistent with the Patriarchal text of the New Testament.[4]

In some cases, words were left in the original Greek where Phountoulēs was undertaking a philological analysis or the examination of the meaning or variation of a specific text in Greek. For example, in question twelve, "In old Euchologia of the Venetian edition, in the prayer of the eighth day from birth we read, '. . . and grant, Lord, to remain ἀνεξάρνητον . . .'[5] while in the modern Euchologia we read, '. . . and grant, Lord to remain ἀνεξάρτητον . . . .'[6] Which is more correct, 'ἀνεξάρνητον' or 'ἀνεξάρτητον?'"; in question thirteen, "We read in the Fiftieth Psalm, 'For behold I was conceived (συνελήφθην) in transgressions and my mother ἐκίσσησε me in sins.'[7] Why does it say 'ἐκίσσησε' and not 'ἐκύησε'? What does 'ἐκίσσησε' mean and why was it used?"; and in question 287, "What must the priest say when after the reading of the Apostolos he blesses the reader: 'Εἰρήνη σοι τῷ ἀναγινώσκοντι'[8] (Peace be to you the one who reads), 'Εἰρήνη σοι τῷ ἀναγνόντι'[9] (Peace be to you who read), 'Εἰρήνη σοι τῷ ἀναγνώσαντι'[10] (Peace be to you who read), or 'Εἰρήνη σοι τῷ ἀναγινώσκοντι καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ' (Peace be to you who reads and to all the people)?"

Consequent adjustments are made in the translation of questions and answers to account for these cases.

4. *Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη ἐγκρίσει τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1912).

5. "... καὶ δός, Κύριε, ἀνεξάρνητον μεῖναι . . ."

6. "... καὶ δός, Κύριε, ἀνεξάρτητον μεῖναι . . ."

7. "Ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἐν ἀνομίαις συνελήφθην, καὶ ἐν ἁμαρτίαις ἐκίσσησέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου."

8. Singular present active masculine dative participle of ἀναγιγνώσκω.

9. Singular aorist active masculine dative participle of ἀναγιγνώσκω.

10. Singular aorist active masculine dative participle of ἀναγιγνώσκω.

# Introduction by the Editors

*"Let each priest question his conscience as to whether he is not himself responsible for the darkness in which his rational sheep still live"* (question 163).

*"Unfortunately, the rational sheep oftentimes shepherd the shepherds instead of being shepherded by them"* (question 280).

## Major Themes

The following discussion of major themes in the *Answers to Liturgical Questions* is based on a free quotation and paraphrase of texts taken and systematized from the work.

According to Phountoulēs, Orthodox worship is exercised within a hierarchically structured ecclesiastical community, which expresses the presence and activity of the universal Church throughout the world and encompasses past and future generations in one mystical body. Public worship is a universal and eternal Liturgy. In this Liturgy, the clergy are called not to perform or conduct something of their own, personal or individual, but to carry out a public work and act as recipients of the Church's commands that are prescribed in the ecclesiastical taxis.[11] The clergy are not called to blind formalism and attachment to dead letter, but to a living and voluntary compliance with the taxis, which has developed under the guidance of the Holy Spirit who forms the institution of the Church. The taxis safeguards ecclesial worship from "arbitrary" actions.

"Arbitrariness" is described as opposed to conformity with the liturgical tradition and especially occurs with changes and embellishments done in the name of some contemporary "theology" or

11. Phountoulēs distinguishes between the public worship of the Church and individual personal prayer where there is much more flexibility.

"manufactured dogmatical preconception," particularly corrections that lack support and are not confirmed by the manuscript tradition, but ostensibly are dictated by theological reasons, which most times are subjective theories and superficial interpretations of the matter. Phountoulēs describes such abuses as a form of "liturgical Protestantism" foreign to the spirit of Orthodox worship, since they appear to presuppose that the Church was found in error up until nowadays, and the Fathers and generations of celebrants did not think or act correctly when basing themselves on tradition. Such changes to liturgical worship are described as confusing, conflicting, inappropriate, and often short-lived. One dangerous result can be to view what is "arbitrary" as normative, and the normative as arbitrary, in contradiction to the Church's living tradition.

As a counter, Phountoulēs strongly advocates the revitalization of liturgical practice and life through a return to the sources. The theoretical reasons for liturgical practice and rubrics are to be sought from the theology of the Fathers and the content of the prayers. The study of the Fathers and the Church's liturgical texts offer the knowledge of the theological meaning of sacred symbols and liturgical forms, which can become a source of the mystagogic instruction of the faithful. In general, the preservation of the sacred forms presupposes their theological interpretation, which the clergy must know for them to able to also teach the people. Otherwise, the forms are at risk for their meaning to be lost and perish. The study of patristic and liturgical texts offers the knowledge of the theological meaning that the sacred symbols and the liturgical forms conceal.

At the same time, Phountoulēs also emphasizes that traditional elements exist, which were forgotten for historical reasons and which, when restored to their ancient place, can contribute a great deal to the revitalization of liturgical practice and life. However, before researching the history of a liturgical form, certain presuppositions are necessary for understanding their individual elements.

1. An understanding of the structure of prayer in Orthodox divine worship.

   Prayers usually begin with a doxology, long or short, and proceed to the commemoration of those elements of the divine economy that foreshadow or justify the ecclesiastical practice. While emboldened by these things, the Church comes to invoke the consecrating grace of the Holy Spirit for the performance of the corresponding sanctifying practice. The prayer is then concluded with the enumeration of the fruits that the faithful will reap from it according to the Lord's will, and with a Trinitarian doxological seal.

2. Local liturgical customs are worthy of special attention because often they preserve ancient traditions and shed light upon the historical growth and the course of development for liturgical forms.

   There exist instances where local tradition is more correct than that which for a variety of reasons generally became prevalent sometimes due to the selection of a particular manuscript by the first publishers of liturgical books. They oftentimes preserve correct elements that were lost in printed editions. Local tradition can have a better liturgical memory. However, the opposite can also be the case. Therefore, these traditions require a study and knowledge of history, of the sources, and of the meaning of the liturgical forms. For this reason, superficial knowledge and conceit have often destroyed respected and correct worship traditions and replaced them with others of a questionable nature in the name of wrongly intended liturgical uniformity. In general, Phountoulēs believes that there exist liturgical traditions preserved in some places that are precious and worthy of respect but often appear insignificant and negligible. In many cases, he believes that they go back to an early antiquity and preserve most important liturgical elements, which later tradition for various reasons rejected or ignored.

3. Most things in divine worship remain undated with the evidence that this or that practice is encountered in such and

such a source or manuscript of a such and such an era or is attested to by A or B author.

When, by whom, and where something was introduced, and when it became widespread, in most cases, are unanswerable. In the historical development of the liturgical forms, antiquity is something that is usually desired, but this does not mean that everything old is necessarily the best, nor that everything relatively modern is the worst. Besides, there are old things that have faded or even disappeared and modern things that have thrived.

4. Printed Orthodox liturgical texts remain problematic.

When printing was discovered in the fifteenth century, various publishers or scholars began slowly to publish Orthodox liturgical books in the West, especially in Venice, where there existed great Greek printing houses. However, these first editions were not, as it was to be expected, faultless publications. Human beings made them, who, despite all their good intentions, had neither the knowledge nor the means to examine and correct the texts. They were reliant on one or two manuscripts that they considered the best and printed them with as much care as possible. However, in this manner, they preserved the chance copyist errors of their manuscripts, to which they also added printing errors. Nevertheless, the evil was perpetuated, because modern editions were often always reprintings of older editions and had their same errors plus also new misprints. The matter did not remain unnoticed by clerical scholars and by the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and for this reason various educated clergy intermittently formed committees for the correction of the liturgical books or undertook their correction officially or unofficially. The most significant effort was made by Bartholomaios Koutloumousianos,[12] from Imbros, who corrected many errors in quite a

12. Bartholomaios Koutloumousianos (Βαρθολομαῖος Κουτλουμουσιανός) (1772–1851) was a hieromonk associated with the Monastery of Koutloumousiou (Μονὴ Κουτλουμουσίου) on Mount Athos, editor of liturgical books, and teacher. Among his accomplishments, he published editions of the Mikron Proseuchētarion (Small Prayerbook) (1828), Mega Hōrologion

few Orthodox liturgical books. In any case, the work is difficult because the various liturgical books must first be studied and published critically, namely on the basis of all, or at least, the most important manuscripts.[13]

5. The recognition that pointless movements and words do not exist in divine worship, namely, each thing has a practical origin that justifies its existence.

   If this is not obvious in contemporary practice, Phountoulēs believes that this was due to some corruption that occurred during the centuries-old history of liturgical forms, which resulted in the disappearance of their original practical purpose. Later liturgical practice often does not discard these virtually "dead" elements but preserves them, wrapped in a kind of "liturgism" as venerable remnants in some manner of their ancient practical purpose.

Phountoulēs emphasizes that the Church's liturgical tradition is not only useful in illuminating these murky elements of worship and in satisfying curiosity about what they mean, what all these once meant, or even in removing certain misunderstandings or distortions of liturgical order; but it can help these liturgical forms recover their original and correct content and fulfill their original and genuine purpose. Phountoulēs stresses that their handling cannot be done without the knowledge of their purpose and meaning, their development, the possibilities that tradition provides, and, naturally, the needs and the problems of contemporary liturgical life. This is precisely the meaning of living tradition; not only to confirm the authenticity of the current forms, but also to revive them while bringing them back to their actual youthful beauty. Consequently,

---

(1832 and 1841), Pentēkostarion (1836), Triōdion (1839 and 1850), and the twelve Mēnaia (1843–1849). This discussion is based on Μ.Ἰ. Γεδεών, "Κουτλουμουσιανός, Βαρθολομαῖος," in MEE 15:92. For additional information, see Δημήτριος Στρατής, *Βαρθολομαῖος Κουτλουμουσιανός (1772–1851) Βιογραφία - Ἐργογραφία* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἀριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, 1999).

13. Recent publications in this area, especially on Mount Athos, reflect the continuing and major influence of Phountoulēs on the Church's liturgical life and practice.

Phountoulēs believes that only after laborious study and research of the sources can small or large liturgical problems be authentically resolved.

Contrariwise, liturgical taxis and tradition can be corrupted or damaged by negligent observance and indifference in the precise knowledge and in the performance of sacred symbolic actions and rites, as well as by misguided excesses and attempts to highlight certain symbols that lack a correct theological basis and traditional establishment. Examples of the latter include the entrance and handover of the Apostolos (questions 111, 210); the chanting of "Behold the darkness and the dawn . . ."[14] during the night of Pascha (question 152); the elevation of the entire paten and/or the holy chalice during "The Holy Things are for the holy..."[15] (questions 181, 233); the addition of long lists of saints or of other phrases in dismissals and other prayers (questions 224, 231); the elevation of the Gospel book during "Blessed is the kingdom . . ."[16] of the Divine Liturgy (question 283); the celebration of the Liturgy of Great Saturday in the koubouklion of the epitaphios (question 357); the crucifixion in the middle of the temple (question 358); and the burning of the street clothes of the newly illumined adult convert (Question 390).

According to Phountoulēs, good intentions and zeal do not justify such excesses. When zeal is not subject to the Church's tradition, this is considered evil and egotistical because the individual is placed above liturgical tradition and the Fathers. Thus, the clergy can, sometimes unintentionally, spoil and distort the very things which they are responsible to correctly preserve, and in a manner contrary to theology, can transform ecclesiastical, namely, communal worship, the public work, "liturgy" in the original and theological meaning of the term, into an individual, private affair.

Regarding such irregularities, Phountoulēs often quotes Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, "But one must also hold to these things, O beloved, which are overlooked by some and seem to be minor to the latter . . . And I say these things for the ignorant. For I myself saw

14. "Ἰδοὺ σκοτία καὶ πρωΐ . . ."
15. "Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις . . ."
16. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία . . ."

most being careless about these matters and believing them to be nearly of no account, and I sighed deeply over them since they knew nothing" (*Dialogue*, chapter 70).[17]

Phountoulēs observes that during historical periods when the Church was found at a high spiritual and theological peak, both the clergy and the people were generally well-catechized and often consciously knew and lived the liturgical life of the Church. Consequently, during such periods, the danger of liturgical deviation was lessened. On the other hand, when theological education and catechism deteriorated and the Church as a whole lived in times of a nearly general decline, deviations from the correct liturgical tradition were also not rare.

Throughout the *Answers to Liturgical Questions*, one of the most consistent themes emphasized is that the conditions of Islamic rule (the Tourkokratia)[18] caused general decline and damage to the liturgical life of the Church. Recovery from this decline and the revitalization of correct liturgical tradition and life in large part provides the motivation for the questions of the audience and the answers of the author. Phountoulēs's work in making widely available the scholarship of holy tradition appears meant to address the needs of the clergy of the Church of Greece during their emergence and transition from a period of survival and conservatism, imposed by necessity, to one in which the Church is able to authentically appropriate its liturgical tradition unencumbered.

Phountoulēs associates the Tourkokratia with the following negatively presented practices: the generalized need for parish priests to serve alone and its associated technical difficulties for the Divine Liturgy (questions 45, 337), the imitation of monastic practice by parish clergy (question 52), the construction of temples of small dimensions (question 153), infrequency of communion and distortions in communion preparation (question 176), the ending of baptisms *en masse* on major feasts and the shifting of baptisms to the home along with the rush to baptize infants as quickly as possible (questions

17. PG 155:237a–237b.

18. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

201, 255), the blessing with the aēr at "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ . . ."[19] during the Divine Liturgy (questions 204 and 205), the aēr and the epitaphios being separated (question 204 and 205), entreaties for the emperor being variously replaced (questions 225, 256, 400, 417), the establishment of the hierarch's presiding outside the bēma during the Divine Liturgy (questions 243–248), the tendency flourishing for the choir to cover with the chanting of troparia every gap that was created in the Divine Liturgy by the reading inaudibly of the priestly prayers (question 279), the abolition of the Palm Sunday procession (question 299), the impossibility of services taking place with the required number of clerical personnel (questions 313–314), the introduction of the apolytikion of Theophany, its kontakion, or the apolytikion of the Baptist into the service of holy baptism (question 278, 348–350), not distributing Holy Communion immediately after baptism when especially difficult conditions in Christian life permitted the celebration of holy baptism in homes (question 354, 362), carved wooden koubouklia in imitation of the koubouklion of the All-holy Sepulchre or the ciborium of the holy table[20] (question 357), the separation of the Church's mysteries and many sacred rites from the Divine Liturgy (question 368), during the forty-day blessing, the prevalence of the male baby being brought into the bēma and not the female (questions 379–381), the forty-day blessing celebrated for baptized children, perhaps without any change to the texts of the prayers since theoretical speculations of such a kind are not common in periods of conservatism (questions 379–381), the deterioration of the washing after baptism (question 418), the reduction to only one pair of readings from the Apostolos and Gospel (question 433), "We have seen the true light . . ."[21] or the apolytikia that are chanted instead of it, being introduced into the Divine Liturgy (question 434), modifications in the hymnology for the service of Saint Dēmētrios (question 450), the highlighting of the importance and symbolism of the censing during "Espe-

19. "Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . ."

20. A ciborium is a structure consisting of a dome supported by columns over the altar table.

21. "Εἴδομεν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν . . ."

cially"[22] of the Divine Liturgy (question 453), the triple repetition of "The servant of God is betrothed . . ." and "The servant of God is crowned . . ." during the celebration of betrothal and marriage (question 465), the tendency for interpolation of ill-timed additions of prayers and troparia before and after holy communion assuming catalytic proportions for the normal conducting of the Divine Liturgy (questions 476–468), high wooden templons (question 513), representations on the panels of the side entrances such as Christ the Good Shepherd, usually on the south door, or of full-bodied hierarchs (question 513), the monastic Typikon becoming completely prevalent in the parishes[23] (question 522), the priest/ephēmerios of parishes, not only praying for, but also praying in place of the people (question 522), the blessing of loaves being detached from the vigil (question 538), and the celebration of the Divine Liturgy connected with Matins (question 558).

Another important theme in the *Answers to Liturgical Questions* is the corporate nature of the Divine Liturgy and the participation of the believer in holy communion. In contrast to personal individual prayer, Phountoulēs emphasizes that in the Divine Liturgy both clergy and laity enter hierarchically ordered into the Body of Christ to attain, with God's grace, and to express their union in Christ, which is realized, with a common attitude and prayer, and is consummated with their approach to communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. For this reason, also, Phountoulēs observes that all of the Liturgy's prayers are composed in a plural number on behalf of the entire mystical body of Christ, of the Church, with the exception only of the prayer, "No one is worthy . . ,"[24] which concerns the individual preparation of the priest for the performance of the mystery.

The believer participates in the mystery of the Holy Eucharist not only with the communion of the mysteries, but also in

22. "Ἐξαιρέτως."

23. When, according to Phountoulēs, the standards of the monastic Typikon were maintained in the temple and secular priests learned by experience to celebrate the matters of worship in the monasteries, which served as schools for training of clergymen.

24. "Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος . . ."

its whole celebration; with the glorification of His name "in one mouth and one heart" together with all of the people of God, with the offering of common entreaties, with the hearing of the word of God, with the offering of His gifts to Him, with the confession of faith, with the kiss of love, and with the remembrance of the saving work of the Lord Jesus, of His mystical supper, of His Passion and Resurrection, of His sitting at the right hand, and of the pouring out of His Holy Spirit. All these are elements of incorporation with the Savior and brethren, with the mystical body of the Church of Christ, which culminates, naturally, in participation in the communion of His Body and Blood. An offering of holy communion without participation in the celebration of the whole Holy Eucharist is a solution of necessity applied by oikonomia only in extraordinary circumstances.

Certainly, the increase of Christians in name only and the decrease of intensity, as well as apathy and poor practice, habituated many in the Orthodox Church with the phenomenon for even those who did not have impediments and a spiritual father's spiritual prohibition not to approach holy communion and for anyone attending church and not communing to be considered a norm and for approaching holy communion to be considered an exception. Namely, the celebration of the mystery of Holy Eucharist and participation in it being changed into a "church service" that is painless and with very little benefit. Despite these things, the Church never ceased regularly—on a daily basis—to celebrate the Divine Liturgy as an invitation, encouragement, and reminder of the need for participation in the mystery of life and to urge by word and action a return to what is right. And its most characteristic activity is that, despite the change of ancient good habits in the meantime, it continued to celebrate the Liturgy of the Presanctified Sanctified Gifts during Great Lent on days that the celebration of the Divine Liturgy is not permitted and to remind in this way that communion stands as an ideal, to which all must be directed, not only on Saturdays and Sundays, but also on the intermediate days of the week, on Wednesdays and Fridays, as in the period of the Great

Fathers (Basileios the Great, *Letter 93, To the Patrician Kaisaria*).[25] The eucharistic fast that is provided for by ecclesiastical tradition and the canons, is that which is observed by priests, namely, the complete abstention of food from the supper of the preceding day, or after midnight, up until the time of holy communion. The fast of three or more days or less, prior to communion, is unknown in ancient tradition.

While belief in the change of the precious gifts into the Body and Blood of Christ and in the real presence of Christ under the consecrated eucharistic species is unshakeable and while honor and worshipful reverence is bestowed to them, as to Christ himself, the Holy Eucharist never deviates from its purpose, which is one and only; the communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord by the faithful. The consecration of the precious gifts does not take place in order to have Christ present and to glorify Him or to pray to Him, but in order for the faithful to partake of communion, to be united through the mysteries, and to be united with Him.

Throughout the *Answers to Liturgical Questions*, another frequent theme is the lack of understanding of printed rubrics in liturgical books. Phountoulēs affirms that the standard rubrics of Orthodox liturgical books are not always clear. However, he attributes this characteristic as chiefly due to their concise character. Namely, in his view, they are not descriptive treatises, in some manner textbooks, which are meant to analyze and to teach how the various services of the Church are conducted for persons who do not know and wish to learn. They are remindful concise instructions for ones knowledgeable of the liturgical taxis. Consequently, it is expected that they presuppose a knowledge of subjects that for those who are experts in divine worship, especially the monks, is self-evident, but for others enigmatic.

---

25. "Ἡμεῖς μέντοιγε τέταρτον καθ' ἑκάστην ἑβδομάδα κοινωνοῦμεν, εν τῇ Κυριακῇ, ἐν τῇ Τετράδι καὶ ἐν τῇ Παρασκευῇ καὶ τῷ Σαββάτῳ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἡμέραις, ἐὰν ᾖ μνήμη Ἁγίου τινός" (We indeed commune four times each week, on Sunday, on Wednesday, and on Friday, and on Saturday, and on other days, if there might be a commemoration of a saint), Basileios the Great, *Letter 93*, ed. and trans. Yves Courtonne, *Saint Basile Lettres*, 3 vols. (Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1957–1966), 1:203–204.

In modern printed editions, an attempt is often made for analysis and clearer expression. However, this is not always successful. And this is because the rubrics are customarily formulated with insufferable pedantry, with twisted syntax, and in an inappropriate pseudo-archaic language, so-called, "ecclesiastical." But even the length that these new rubrics employ also make them practically unwieldy, if not useless, since the red letters of the rubrics often end up being more than the black ones of the text.

In Phountoulēs's view, the liturgical book is a book handy for the performance of divine worship, which is used at the time of worship by the priest, deacon, reader, and chanter. By necessity, the standard rubrics, to correctly fulfill their purpose, must be concise and simple and syntactically worded "side by side," just as in the old Typika and in the formal instructions inserted into the ancient manuscripts and into the old, printed editions. They are not educational books for those who do not know but tools in the experienced hands of celebrants or the other officiants of worship. Clarity always remains the desirable outcome.

As a final observation, one of the most important responses of the *Answers to Liturgical Questions* occurs to question 416, "It is often said by many that the Divine Liturgy lasts too long, and Christians become fatigued. If this is a serious reason, how would it be possible and at what points could some shortening take place for its length to be reduced?"

Rather than outlining a series of abridgments, Phountoulēs calls for the return to decent celebration, namely, the return to more exact and full liturgical forms, where poor development in parish temples has brought about decay that damages the sound traditional and liturgical structure of the central service of worship, the Divine Liturgy. The author states that "at some point" the clergy must think seriously and responsibly not only regarding abridgments, but about the restoration of the decay to the body of our liturgical practice, which damages it very seriously and exposes them to the eyes of all pious people, who received from them the liturgical tradition and maintained it "like an apple of the eye," in contrast with what is done "so irresponsibly."

Moreover, Phountoulēs believes that what increases the time length of the Divine Liturgy and probably makes it fatiguing is not only what is said and chanted during it, but how is it is said and chanted. The author observes that the tempo of the chanting and the enunciation can be done in a way that not only does not fatigue but keeps the dialogue of priest and people constantly lively and vibrant. However, the author believes that in parishes during more modern times, the chanting in the Divine Liturgy has taken a different course, which certainly is not traditional. The emphasis is placed on the chanting and on the elaborate musical enunciation of the diaconal petitions and of the priest's exclamations. As a corrective, ecclesiastical music must be viewed as the adornment and the musical garment for the sacred hymns, and that it serves worship and is integrated within its entire liturgical climate. It is not an end, but a means. When the means is diverted in purpose, the result is an adulterated condition that is catastrophic for true worship. The more the chanter and choir are isolated from the people, the more they will stray from the right path.

In concluding his answer and addressing "the unacceptable and anti-Orthodox approach of omitting or shortening the very prayers of the Liturgy," Phountoulēs quotes the "Instruction for a priest"[26] that is attributed to Basileios the Great: "Stand in compunction and purity of heart in the holy sanctuary, not looking around here and there, but standing with fear and shuddering before the Heavenly King. Neither rush through nor shorten the prayers because of human weakness, nor have a high regard for a human person, but look only towards the King who is present and the Hosts that stand around Him."[27]

26. "Παράγγελμα εἰς ἱερέα."

27. Compare the translation in *The Liturgikon: The Book of Divine Services for the Priest and Deacon*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Dickinson Press, 1989), xi.

## Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki (d. 1429)

In the *Answers to Liturgical Questions*, Phountoulēs frequently references the writings of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki as part of his methodology of finding the theoretical reasons for liturgical practice and rubrics through a return to the sources, namely, the study of the Fathers and the Church's liturgical texts. His study of this fifteenth century Byzantine writer, beginning with a pioneering work in 1966, made Symeōn "more widely known for the first time" and revealed the "historical and theological presuppositions" of the latter's explanatory texts.[28]

28. This is the assessment of Panagiotēs I. Skaltsēs in the present volume. For a basic but not exhaustive bibliography concerning Saint Symeōn, see René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 245–263; Ἰωαννης Φουντούλης, *Τὸ λειτουργικὸν ἔργον Συμεὼν τοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης: Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν καὶ θεωρίαν τῆς θείας Λατρείας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἑταιρεία Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν, 1966); Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, ed., *Συμεὼν ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης, Τὰ λειτουργικὰ συγγράμματα. I Εὐχαὶ καὶ Ὕμνοι*, Ἐπισημονικαὶ Πραγματεῖαι, Σειρὰ Φιλολογικὴ καὶ Θεολογική 10 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἑταιρεία Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν, 1968); David Balfour, *Politico-Historical Works of Symeon, Archbishop of Thessalonica (1416/17 to 1429): Critical Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*, Wiener Byzantinistische Studien XIII (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1979); David Balfour, *Ἁγίου Συμεὼν Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης (1416/7 – 1429), Ἔργα Θεολογικά: Κριτικὴ Ἔκδοση μετ' Εἰσαγωγῆς*, Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων 34 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1981); David Balfour, "St. Symeon of Thessalonica: A Polemical Hesychast," *Sobornost* 4 (1982): 6–21; David Balfour, "Saint Symeon of Thessalonike as a Historical Personality," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 28 (1983): 55–72; David Balfour, "New Data on the Late Byzantine Saint, Symeon of Thessalonika," *Macedonian Studies* 6 (1989): 40–48; Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, "Περὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας," in *Ἡ Θεία εὐχαριστία. Εἰσηγήσεις, πορίσματα, ἱερατικοῦ συνεδρίου τῆς ἱερᾶς μητροπόλεως Δράμας* (Δράμα: Ἱερὰ Μητροπόλεως Δράμας, 2003), 249–371; Nicholas P. Constas, "Symeon of Thessalonike and the Theology of the Icon Screen," in *Thresholds of the Sacred: Architectural, Art Historical, Liturgical, and Theological Perspectives on Religious Screens, East and West*, ed. Sharon E. J. Gerstel (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), 163–183; Demetrios Bathrellos, "St. Symeon of Thessalonica and the Question of the Primacy of the Pope," *Sobornost* 30 (2008): 54–71; and Steven Hawkes-Teeples, ed. and trans., *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika, The Liturgical Commentaries*, vol. 168 of *Studies and Texts* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2011).

In summary, Saint Symeōn was born in fourteenth century Constantinople, consecrated archbishop of Thessaloniki the second largest city in the Byzantine Empire in 1416/1417, and died in 1429, six months before the latter city fell to the Ottoman Turks in March 1430. The Holy and Sacred Synods of the Church of Greece and the Ecumenical Patriarchate proclaimed him a saint on May 3, 1981. In the *Answers to Liturgical Questions*, Phountoulēs refers to three major works of Symeōn: the *Dialogue against all heresies (Διάλογος κατὰ πασῶν τῶν αἱρέσεων)*,[29] "a collection of more than a dozen semi-independent treatises dealing with the faith and ritual practices of the Orthodox Church"[30] in 373 chapters composed in the form of a dialogue between a hierarch and priest or deacon with a catechetical purpose addressed to clergy[31]; the *Explanation concerning the divine temple* (*Ἑρμηνεία περὶ τοῦ θείου ναοῦ*),[32] a symbolical commentary on the temple, the sacred vessels, and the hierarchical Divine Liturgy as well as a polemic against the Latins; and a series of eighty-three answers to questions posed on a variety of topics (thirty-one of which primarily concern liturgical subjects) and attributed to Metropolitan Gabriēl of Pentapolis.[33] For the first two works, the edition of Steven Hawkes-Teeples will be referenced where applicable in the present translation of the *Answers to Liturgical Questions* (Steven Hawkes-Teeples, ed. and trans., *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika, The Liturgical Commentaries,* vol. 168 of *Studies and Texts.* Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2011).

29. PG 155:33a–696d. The full title of the work is *Συμεὼν διάλογος ἐν Χριστῷ κατὰ πασῶν τῶν αἱρέσεων καὶ περὶ τῆς μόνης πίστεως τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῶν ἱερῶν τελετῶν τε καὶ μυστηρίων πάντων τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, οὐδὲν αὐτοῦ ἴδιον κεκτημένος, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν καὶ τῶν Πατέρων ἐρανισθεὶς αὐτῷ καὶ συντεθεὶς κατὰ δύναμιν, ἀπολογίας διδοὺς ἑκάστῳ τῶν κατὰ καιροὺς ἠρωτηκότων.*

30. Constas, "Symeon of Thessalonike," 164.

31. Ἰωαννης Φουντούλης, *Τὸ λειτουργικὸν ἔργον Συμεών*, 32, 34.

32. PG 155:697a–830b. The full title of the work is, *Ἑρμηνεία περί τε τοῦ θείου ναοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ ἱερέων τε περὶ καὶ διακόνων, ἀρχιερέων τε καὶ τῶν ὧν ἕκαστος στολῶν ἱερῶν περιβάλλεται, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῆς θείας μυσταγωγίας λόγον ἑκάστῳ διδοῦσα τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ τελουμένων θείως καὶ τοῖς ἐν Κρήτῃ εὐσεβέσι ζητήσασιν ἀποσταλεῖσα.*

33. PG 155:830c–952d. The full title of the work is *Ἀποκρίσεις πρός τινας ἐρωτήσεις ἀρχιερέως ἠρωτηκότος αὐτόν.*

# The Liturgiologist Professor
## I. M. PHOUNTOULĒS (1927–2007) HIS PERSONALITY AND WORK

**by Panagiotēs I. Skaltsēs**
**Associate Professor of the Theological School, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki**

It has been written that Thessaloniki is considered as the preeminent "habitat" of Orthodox Theology.[1] Top-ranking professors at the Theological School, among whom also the liturgiologist of international fame Iōannēs Phountoulēs, made a decisive contribution to the formation of this reality, namely, to the development and cultivation of theological studies and of theological thought and productivity based in the biblical, patristic, and liturgical tradition. An everyday man, gentle of mood and mild, with great discretion, simplicity, and grace; a wise teacher, who girded himself with the linen towel[2] of instruction, and with a love which "is kind" and "is not boastful."[3]

A liturgical researcher with critical thought and a rich theoretical apparatus, elements that revealed him to be a herald and preacher of "the liturgical matters" in our era. Regarding these subjects, "the small and the large,"[4] of divine worship, he worked with persistence, patience, and optimism, always inspired by Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki and the Kollybades. "I say"—he writes in his letter to a learned priest—"sow and God will water and increase them. One is the sower, and another is the reaper. The improvement of liturgical matters is a long-term affair and has hundreds of parameters."[5]

---

1. Στυλιανός, Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Αὐστραλίας, *Ἡ Θεσσαλονίκη ὡς ὁ κατ' ἐξοχὴν «βιότοπος» τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Θεολογίας* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1997), 15.
2. John 10:4.
3. 1 Cor 13:4.
4. Compare Psalm 103:25.
5. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, "Μία ἀλληλογραφία γιὰ λειτουργικὰ θέματα," *Ἀνάπλασις* 437 (2008): 151.

So, we will attempt to present in the following the personality and the far-reaching work of the experienced liturgiologist, and according to the aptly framed expression, of a follower "of the liturgical tradition of the Kollybades."[6]

## Studies—Academic Career—Scholarly Work—Social Presence

Iōannēs Phountoulēs is a scion of the land of Asia Minor. On November 26, 1927, he was born, in Mesagros of Gera of Lesbos,[7] of parents from Aïvali.[8] In his hometown, he completed a course of general education and in Mytilene[9] finished the six-form gymnasium at that time, at the feet of good teachers. These his origins also marked his future course, which was distinguished by Asia Minor nobility, piety leavened with liturgical experiences, inordinate love for the place that nurtured him, both reverence and promotion of the saints, as well as the monuments and culture of Ionia and Lesbos. He wrote and spoke continuously about these things. Indicative of the experiences that determined his life are also what he notes regarding the Kydōniatissa Panagia.[10] "I knew the Panagia Phanerōmenē[11] of Kydōnies[12] from the time that I knew the world. Endless narratives of my father, when their house was precisely across from the 'Hagiasma'[13] in the corner with the 'wide alley,' surrounded the discovery of her icon, miracles, as well as her honoring and celebration during the enniamera,[14] and the gathering of innumerable Christian and

6. *Εὐχολόγιον Α'. Ἁγιασματάριον* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἐκδ. Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας, 2001), η'.

7. Mesagros is a town of the municipality of Gera located on the island of Lesbos.

8. A city on the Western coast of Asia Minor (present-day Ayvalek) across from the island of Lesbos (Mytilene).

9. A Greek island in the Aegean Sea.

10. The icon of the Virgin Mary (Παναγία) from the city of Aïvali, or Kydōnies, its ancient name.

11. The icon of the Panagia Virgin Mary (Παναγία) revealed (Φανερωμένη), the epithet here referring to an event of her icon's discovery.

12. The ancient name for the city of Aïvali.

13. The sacred spring of the Virgin.

14. "Τὰ Ἐννιάμερα." This is the ninth day from the feast of the Dormition (August 15). It is common that chapels and icons of the Theotokos, which

Muslim pilgrims. All his childhood and juvenile memories were connected with her. But the most important thing was that the life of his family always flowed under the loving motherly gaze of her icon. His mother[15] had brought a copy of the Phanerōmenē from Aïvali during the persecution of 1922, which was almost the only object that they rescued from their home."[16]

With this spiritual and cultural shield, he went to Athens for studies at the Theological School, from which he received his degree with "excellent full marks" in 1950. During the duration of his studies, he built strong friendships that later honored the Church as well as theology. A characteristic example is his bond with the metropolitan of New Smyrna Chrysostomos Boultsos of blessed memory,[17] concerning which at a special event for him, he states that "he always was a 'child for Christ.' It did not matter if one mistook this his childish behavior in simplicity and innocence as immaturity... To all of us, he left 'an example' of wisdom and faith, life and energy, 'perfect love' which 'casts out' every fear (1 John 4:18), every hypocrisy, every worldly care, every earthly contemptible glory."[18]

In addition, he came to know in Athens the Hagioritic tradition in the metochi[19] of the Ascension, of the sacred monastery of Simōnos Petras, in the municipality of Vyronas[20] and at the feet of

---

are not dedicated to the Dormition, are often also celebrated on this day. Phountoulēs is indicating that this is the case for the icon of the Panagia Phanerōmenē of Kydōnies.

15. Namely, the grandmother of Phountoulēs.

16. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, *Ἡ Παναγία Φανερωμένη τῶν Κυδωνιῶν (Ἀϊβαλί)* (Μυτιλήνη: n.p., 2000), 7. Compare Π.Ι. Σκαλτσῆς, "Ὁ σοφὸς δάσκαλος τῶν θεολογικῶν γραμμάτων. Ὁ Κυδωνιάτης Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης," *Μικρασιατικὴ Ἠχώ* 49, no. 387 (Μάρτιος-Ἀπρίλιος 2007): 13.

17. Chrystostomos Boultsos (Χρυσόστομος Βούλτσος), (1927–1986, Metropolitan of New Smyrna, 1974–1986).

18. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, "Ὁ Μητροπολίτης Νέας Σμύρνης Χρυσόστομος Βοῦλτσος. Μία δεκαετία ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του (1986-1996)" (Ὁμιλία στὴν ἐκδήλωση στὴν αἴθουσα τῶν Ο.Χ.Ε. 15.12.1996), *Ἀνησυχίες, Περιοδικὸ Χριστιανικοῦ Ὁμίλου Φοιτητῶν καὶ Ἐπιστημόνων* 24, no. 74 (Ἰανουάριος-Δεκέμβριος 2006): 7–8.

19. This is a dependency of a monastic community. In this case, the metochi was a dependency of Simōnos Petras, a monastery of Mount Athos, signified by the word, "Hagioritic" (ἁγιορείτικη).

20. A suburb of Athens.

the fathers Hierōnymos and Phōtios, experienced monks and deeply knowledgeable of liturgical precision, "in spirit and truth."[21] This, his apprenticeship at the analogion[22] and the general worshipful atmosphere of the temple of the Ascension, taught him many things, which he later utilized and formulated just as much in his literary as in his didactic work. His basic principles, for example, that the Typikon is not a theoretical hypothesis, but is taught in practice, makes perceptible the unity of the ecclesiastical body in worship, and reveals the mind of the sacred-service and the things signified in it, have their roots in the first-hand experience of the liturgiologist of blessed memory during the student years.

A significant milestone in his historical journey was his military service from 1950 to 1953 in Western Macedonia and chiefly in Kastoria, Siatista, and Tsotyli. He loved this place and was beloved by its inhabitants, who comfortably associated with him and listened to him speak during his traverses and sermons. It is worth us noting his acquaintance with Fr. Chrysostomos Zapheiropoulos of blessed memory, the "contemporary saint of Tsotyli," as the same one characterizes him in a published obituary.[23] In the house of this holy man, according to the oral testimony of the writer, he saw for the first time the work of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki in the incunabulum edition of Dositheos the patriarch of Jerusalem (in "Iaşi of Moldavia" in 1683).[24] From that time, scholarly interest began re-

21. John 4:23.

22. "ἀναλόγιον" can be translated here as "lectern." In parish practice, the analogion is often a multi-sided slanted stand incorporating shelving space for the storage of liturgical books for the reader and chanter. It is sometimes described in English as the "chanting stand."

23. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, "Χρυσόστομος Ζαφειρόπουλος, Ἀρχιμ., ὁ σύγχρονος ἅγιος τοῦ Τσοτυλίου," *Ὁ Ποιμὴν* 47 (1981): 18–19. Chrysostomos Zapheiropoulos (Χρυσόστομος Ζαφειρόπουλος) (1921–1980), was a graduate of the school of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Halki and an archimandrite.

24. Δοσίθεος τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ed., *Συμεών τοῦ Μακαρίου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης κατὰ αἱρέσεων, καὶ περὶ τῆς μόνης ὀρθῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἡμῶν πίστεως τῶν τε ἱερῶν τελετῶν καὶ μυστηρίων τῆς ἐκκλησίας διάλογος: περί τε τοῦ θείου ναοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ ἀρχιερέων τε περὶ ἱερέων καὶ διακόνων . . . μεθ' ὧν τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ λογιωτάτου Μάρκου Εὐγενικοῦ Μητροπολίτου Ἐφέσου ἐξήγησις τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας . . .* (Ἐν Γιασίῳ τῆς Μολδοβίας: ἐν τῇ σεβασμίᾳ

garding the liturgiologist Father, whose texts and *Answers* regarding worship marked his liturgical thought and research career.

After his military service, from 1953 until 1956, Iōannēs Phountoulēs served as an assistant at the Theological School of the University of Athens at the feet of Geōrgios Sōteriou,[25] the professor of archaeology of blessed memory. This explains his knowledge of Byzantine archaeology and his interest in art in relation to divine worship, although he himself, with the humor that distinguished him, said that he was neither an archaeologist nor "the son of an archaeologist"! He states somewhere, "My 'knowledge is imperfect, and prophecy is imperfect.'[26] My area of expertise is different, liturgics, namely, the history and the theory of Christian worship. However, the sacred arts lead to this and serve this."[27] He did not even want the title of his area of expertise. At an unsuspecting time, he had expressed himself with "did I perhaps say that I am a liturgiologist." It pleased him only to say that "the title 'Professor of Liturgics' is sufficient."[28]

In any case, the truth is that he was called a liturgiologist, since from a very young age he had been leavened with divine worship[29] and served it until the end. He was by common recognition the liturgiologist of the Church[30] and "was rightly considered and valued as

---

Πατριαρχικῇ καὶ αὐθεντικῇ μονῇ τῶν πρωτοκορυφαίων Ἀποστόλων τῇ καλουμένῃ Τζετατζούϊα, ΑΧΠΓ, [1683]). Iaşi is a city in Eastern Romania.

25. Geōrgios Sōteriou (Γεώργιος Σωτηρίου) (1880–1965) was professor of archaeology from 1924–1952 at the University of Athens.

26. 1 Cor 13:9.

27. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, "Θεία Λατρεία καὶ τέχνη. Σχέσεις Λατρείας καὶ τεχνῶν στὸν Ὀρθόδοξο Ναό," *Τελετουργικὰ Θέματα* (Ἀθήνα: Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 2006), 2:76.

28. "Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης (1927-2007)," Συμβολή, *Ἐπιθεώρησις τοῦ Ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ Τυπικοῦ εἰς τὴν τάξιν τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Λατρείας* 17 (Ἰαν.-Μάρτ. 2007): 13.

29. Π. Ι. Σκαλτσῆς, "'Μακαρία ἡ ὁδός . . . † Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης (1927–2007). Ὁ λειτουργιολόγος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας," *Ἀνάπλασις* 427 (2007): 28.

30. Β. Ι. Καλλιακμάνης (Πρωτοπρ.), "Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης. Ὁ λειτουργιολόγος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας (1927-2007)" *Ὀρθοδοξία*, περ. Β΄, 14, no. 1 (Ἰανουάριος-Μάρτιος 2007): 195–201. See also, *Τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν Λατρείαν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Πρακτικὰ Θ΄ Πανελληνίου Λειτουργικοῦ Συμποσίου Στελεχῶν Ἱερῶν Μητροπόλεων, Βόλος, 5-7 Νοεμβρίου 2007* (Ἀθήνα, n.p., 2009), 9–17.

an authority of modern times, leaving behind a large number of writings."[31] As noted by the emeritus professor at the Theological School of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Mr. Stergios Sakkos, "all worldwide Orthodoxy is remembered for Iōannēs Phountoulēs, the greatest and most modest liturgiologist of our days. His late professor in liturgics, Panagiōtēs Trempelas, was especially proud of him and considered him his brilliant pride."[32]

The starting point of his liturgical career is found in the appreciation that Panagiōtēs Trempelas of blessed memory nurtured for him and the collaboration that he had with him. In fact, at an event that took place in Stemnitsa of Gortynia,[33] on October 2, 2005, the student Iōannēs Phountoulēs repaid in the best manner the debt owed to his teacher and evaluated his work by saying; "The greatest honor for the subordinate is none other than to recognize in himself the sprout of the scientific seed of that one, and any fruitfulness as a consequence of his sowing . . . This pioneer envisions the exodus of the people of God, of the Church, from a formal liturgical religiosity in which they lived and which the piety of the Christ-bearing clergy and people maintained in difficult times, which, however, were past forevermore with the grace of God. The liturgical life had to be revived according to the models of the great period of the heyday of the times of the great Fathers of the Church. The form to find substance again. The spirit to renovate the letter. Worship to become alive and rational again, feeding the conscious piety of the people of God, offering them manna and water from the stone in the desert of the world, renewing them in Christ and essentially promoting the work of their salvation. In other words: He envisioned whatever

31. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, "Ἐκδημία Καθηγητοῦ Ἰωάννου Φουντούλη," *Ὀρθοδοξία*, περ. Β΄, 14, issue no. 1 (Ἰανουάριος-Μάρτιος 2007): 242.

32. Στέργιος Σάκκος, "Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, ὁ σοφὸς καὶ σεμνὸς λειτουργιολόγος," *Ὀρθόδοξος Τύπος*, March 23, 2007, 3. Stergios Sakkos (Στέργιος Σάκκος) (1930–2012). Panagiōtēs Trempelas (Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας) (1886–1977).

33. Stemnitsa is a village in the municipality of Gortyna located in Arcadia in the Peloponnese.

also nowadays the Church pursues and works for its achievement, namely, the so-called 'Liturgical renewal.'"[34]

Therefore, encouraged by his first, wise, and experienced teacher on liturgics, Panagiōtēs Trempelas, he went to Belgium and studied philology and the history of the Christian East for three years (1956–1959) at the Oriental Institute of the Catholic University of Louvain, where he also distinguished himself. In addition, he attended courses relevant to liturgics in theology and philosophy also at the School of Religious Sciences of the same University. He also studied at the Institut supérieur de liturgie of the liturgical center of the Abbey of Mont César in Louvain. As part of his postgraduate studies in Belgium, he had the opportunity to study with eminent liturgiologists such as B. Capelle and B. Botte.[35] In addition, the scholars of the East, G. Caritte and R. Draguet, were also his professors.[36] He worked in the library of the Bollandists in Brussels at the feet of hagiological researcher Fr. François Halkin[37] and became closely acquainted with the manner of liturgy of the liturgical centers of Chevetogne, Mont César, and those in Paris.

During the summer semester of the academic year 1959–1960, he went to Trier in West Germany where he attended the classes and tutorials of liturgics and homiletics of Professor B. Fischer at the theological school there.[38] In addition, he worked at the liturgical centers of Trier and the monastery of Maria Laach. During the years 1957–1960, he attended the regular liturgical conferences of

34. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, "Ὁ Καθηγητὴς Παναγιώτης Ν. Τρεμπέλας ὡς λειτουργιολόγος," *Συμβολή, Ἐπιθεώρησις τοῦ Ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ Τυπικοῦ εἰς τὴν τάξιν τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Λατρείας* 14 (Πεντηκοστὴ 2006): 3–4.

35. Bernard Capelle (1884–1961) was the abbot of Mont César, 1928–1952. Bernard Botte (1893–1980).

36. Gérard Garitte (1914–1990), an historian specializing in the Church of Georgia. René Draguet (1896–1980), who was suspended from teaching by the Holy Office, see Ward de Pril, *Theological Renewal and the Resurgence of Integrism: The René Draguet Case (1942) in Its Context*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium (Leuven: Peeters, 2016).

37. François Halkin (1901–1988).

38. Balthasar Fischer (1912–2001), a student of the liturgical scholar Josef Jungmann and who specialized in the study of the catechumenate. He was a professor of liturgy on the theological faculty of the University of Trier.

the Russian Institut de théologie orthodoxe Saint-Serge in Paris, the "liturgical weeks" (*semaines liturgiques*)[39] for professors of liturgics of the liturgical center of the Mont César, and the Liturgical Congress of Munich (1960).[40]

After his three-year stay and his excellent studies abroad, he returned to Greece to pursue a brilliant academic career, being recognized indeed even by scholars outside the area of theology and university professors, philologists, archaeologists, Byzantinists, and scholars of folklore. Very often at conferences and scholarly meetings, the phrase "Phountoulēs is well educated"[41] was heard from secular researchers. His scholarly-academic career had the following course. In the year 1961, he was appointed assistant[42] of the chair of the Department of Liturgics – Homiletics at the Theological School of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, a position in which he served until the year 1966. During the years 1961–1963 he attended the cycle of courses of the chair Professor Evangelos Theodōrou[43] as well as the Patristics tutorial of the Professor Panagiōtēs Chrēstou of blessed memory.[44]

In December of the year 1961 he went to Italy for a period of one month in order to study liturgical manuscripts in the libraries of Venice, Florence, the Vatican, and Kryptopherrēs.[45] In October 1964 he was awarded a doctorate, after submitting to the Theological School of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki a dissertation on the subject: "The twenty-four-hour sleepless doxology."[46] In the prologue of this work, he first thanks his Professor Evangelos Theodōrou "for the kind introduction and the valuable suggestions."

---

39. A series of annual gatherings.
40. The 37th International Eucharistic Congress, July 31–August 7, 1960.
41. "Ὁ Φουντούλης ξέρει γράμματα."
42. "βοηθός."
43. Concerning his personality and work, see Ἠλίας Βουλγαράκης, et al., eds., *Ἄξιες καὶ Πολιτισμός. Ἀφιέρωμα στὸν Καθηγητὴ Εὐάγγελο Θεοδώρου* (Ἀθήνα: n.p., 1991). See also, *Ἐκκλησία*, 81, no. 2 (2004): 119–135. Evangelos Theodōrou (Εὐάγγελος Θεοδώρου) (1921–2018).
44. Panagiōtēs Chrēstou (Παναγιώτης Χρήστου) (1917–1995).
45. This is the Monastery of Grottaferrata founded in 1004 and located near Rome.
46. "Ἡ εἰκοσιτετράωρος ἀκοίμητος δοξολογία."

In general, Iōannēs Phountoulēs had a special respect and great appreciation for this exceptional man, tireless researcher, and wise teacher. In an event that the Sacred Synod of the Church of Greece organized in honor of Mr. Theodōrou (January 16, 2004), among others, Professor Iōannēs Phountoulēs stressed that "he did not bury the treasure of his liturgical research in the ground, but deposited it with bankers, circulated it as a healthy coin in the hands of the Church, in the hands of the people of God. Namely, it did not distract him from his immediate and ultimate purpose; he did not egocentrically remain in the narcissistic admiration of the beauty of worship, which he was increasingly discovering; he did not lock himself in the reading room; he did not 'whisper' but proclaimed 'on the housetops.'[47] He was and is a student and a teacher, the initiate into the mysteries and initiator, the catechumen and catechist, the wise man who makes wise, and the rich man who enriches others."[48]

In the year 1966, Iōannēs Phountoulēs of blessed memory was elected lecturer[49] of the chair of Liturgics–Homiletics, after he submitted a dissertation with the title: "The Liturgical work of Symeōn of Thessaloniki—(A contribution to the history and theory of divine worship)."[50] With this study, the work of the Byzantine liturgiologist becomes more widely known for the first time and the historical and theological presuppositions of his explanatory texts are revealed, which up until nowadays satisfies in the best manner the demand of the liturgical renaissance "always of course based on the sources of Orthodox tradition."[51]

From the academic year 1966–1967, he taught the Byzantine liturgical form to the Theological School's second-year students as an

47. Matt 10:27.

48. *Ἐκκλησία*, 81, issue 2, (Φεβρουάριος 2004): 123.

49. "ὑφηγητής."

50. "Τὸ λειτουργικὸν ἔργον Συμεὼν τοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης—(Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν καὶ θεωρίαν τῆς Θείας Λατρείας)." This was a "διατριβὴ ἐπὶ ὑφηγεσίᾳ," a type of postdoctoral dissertation required in order to be a "lecturer" (ὑφηγητής).

51. Γ. Ν. Μαντζαρίδης, "Ἰωάννου Φουντούλη, Τὸ λειτουργικὸν ἔργον Συμεὼν τοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης (Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν καὶ θεωρίαν τῆς θείας Λατρείας), Θεσσαλονίκη 1966, pp. 180," *Ἑλληνικά* 20 (1967): 460.

adjunct lecturer.[52] With the departure of Professor Evangelos Theodōrou to Athens and his appointment to the administration of the Apostolikē Diakonia of the Church of Greece, during 1967–1968, he also taught the course of homiletics to the School's third-year students. During the years 1966–1967 and 1967–1968, he taught homiletics, hymnology, and hagiology in the Higher Ecclesiastical School of Thessaloniki,[53] as well as liturgics, hymnology, and hagiology in the Higher Ecclesiastical Tutorial School of Thessaloniki.[54]

In 1969, he was elected regular professor[55] of the chair of Liturgics–Homiletics and for nearly three decades he worthily served theological scholarship, the Church, and society. During this period, he served twice as Dean from 1970–1973, Senator,[56] and President of the Pastoral Department during the first years of its operation (1982–1984). He also taught liturgical courses at the Ecclesiastical Pedagogical Academy[57] (Pylaia)[58] during the years 1977–1985 and liturgiology at the Department of Theology. He was a regular member of ΔΙΚΑΤΣΑ[59] (1985–1995), a member of the committees of the State Scholarship Foundation,[60] a member of the Divine Worship Committee of the Permanent Holy Synod of the Church of Greece as well as the special Synodal Committee for Liturgical Renewal, and a member of the Dialogue Committee with the Pre-Chalcedonians for liturgical and pastoral issues.

---

52. "ἐντεταλμένος ὑφηγητής."
53. "Ἀνωτέρα Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Σχολὴ Θεσσαλονίκης."
54. "Ἀνώτερο Ἐκκλησιαστικὸ Φροντιστήριο Θεσσαλονίκης." We drew on information regarding the studies of the Professor of blessed memory from the ΘΗΕ 11:1203–1204 and chiefly from his own mimeographed *Ὑπόμνημα πρὸς τὴν Θεολογικὴν Σχολὴν τοῦ Ἀριστοτελείου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης, Περὶ τῶν σπουδῶν, τῆς δράσεως καὶ τῶν ἐπιστημονικῶν ἐργασιῶν αὐτοῦ* (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 1969).
55. "τακτικός καθηγητής."
56. Namely, a member of the academic senate of the University.
57. "Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Παιδαγωγικὴ Ἀκαδημία."
58. "Πυλαία." Pylaia is a municipality in the prefecture of Thessaloniki.
59. Τὸ Διαπανεπιστημιακὸ Κέντρο Ἀναγνώρισης Τίτλων Σπουδῶν τῆς Ἀλλοδαπῆς (ΔΙ.Κ.Α.Τ.Σ.Α.) (The Interuniversity Center for the Recognition of Diplomas of Foreign Studies).
60. "Ἵδρυμα Κρατικῶν Ὑποτροφιῶν."

As a lecturer and, a little later, as a professor and dean, he directed the Institute of Sacred Preachers of the Sacred Metropolis of Thessaloniki[61] (from September 1968) under the Metropolitan of Thessaloniki, Leōnidas, of blessed memory.[62] This remarkable effort in collaboration with the New Testament scholarly hermeneuts of the School of Theology of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Professor S. Agouridēs of blessed memory,[63] Professor S. Sakkos,[64] Professor I. Karavidopoulos,[65] and the then doctor,[66] Professor B. Stogiannos of blessed memory,[67] greatly benefited the Sacred Preachers and had as a result the publication of two volumes with the interpretation of the gospel pericopes for the Sundays of the year, as well as also the publication of Vespers interpretive sermons on the themes, 1. "Living Hope"[68] (1 Peter) by Basilēs P. Stogiannos and 2. *The Redemptive Passion*[69] (Luke 22–23) by Iōannēs D. Karavidopoulos.

As a professor, he opened new horizons in the courses related to divine worship and upgraded liturgical scholarship, by creating a School through his initiatives and choices, the work of which is imprinted in the rich research production concerning divine worship today, in the liturgical education of both clergy and laity upgraded in recent years, but also in the shepherding Church's interest to ac-

61. "Τὸ Φροντιστήριο τῶν Ἱεροκηρύκων τῆς Ἱερᾶς Μητροπόλεως Θεσσαλονίκης."

62. Leōnidas of Thessaloniki (Λεωνίδας) (1904–1984, r. 1968–1974).

63. Sabbas Agouridēs (Σάββας Ἀγουρίδης) (1921–2009), a New Testament professor at the Theological School of the University of Athens.

64. Stergios Sakkos (Στέργιος Σάκκος) (1930–2012), a New Testament professor at the Theological School of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

65. Iōannēs Karabidopoulos (Ἰωάννης Καραβιδόπουλος) (b. 1937), a New Testament professor at the Theological School of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

66. Namely, a person holding a PhD.

67. Basilēs Stogiannos (Βασίλης Στογιάννος) (1939-1985), a New Testament professor at the Theological School of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

68. "Ἐλπὶς ζῶσα."

69. Τὸ Σωτήριον Πάθος (1974).

cept and to process his own scholarly documented liturgical opinion and testimony.[70]

Hard-working, methodical, with love for his subject and a visionary of a rational and vital worship, he proceeded according to a plan in three directions, with first, the educational process, second the study of the sources and the publication of the liturgical texts, and third, openness to society and the pastoral utilization of his scholarly research.

As for the first, he enriched the educational program with liturgical courses in nearly all the semesters of the Department that he served, such as Introduction to Divine Worship, History and Theology of Worship, Hymnology, Hagiology and Celebration, Interpretation of Liturgical Texts, History and Theory of Preaching, and Chanting and Musicology. He was particularly interested in the liturgical arts because precisely in them Orthodox theology is expressed and, when associated with tradition, they form the basis for the spiritual and cultural upgrading and elevation of contemporary humanity. In addition, he organized the weekly (every Thursday) Liturgical Workshop for the students' training and their participation in celebrations. In the workshop, this was of particular importance, because he considered it not only as a supervision, but also a vision "for the improvement of our liturgical matters in the context of completely precise tradition and the correct taxis of divine worship."[71] Religious occasions outside the School were equally important, especially in sacred monasteries, but also the observation of Liturgies of other liturgical forms in Thessaloniki, such as, for example, the Armenians and Roman Catholics.

As for the second, namely, scholarly research, apart from the publication of the prayers and hymns of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki,[72] which form a part of his unpublished work, as a profound expert of the manuscript tradition and liturgical sources, he was in-

70. Namely, that the Church was highly influenced by the impact of his scholarly work.

71. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, *Λειτουργικὴ Α΄. Εἰσαγωγὴ στὴ θεία Λατρεία*, 4th ed. (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 2004), 20.

72. Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, ed., *Συμεὼν ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης, Τὰ λειτουργικὰ συγγράμματα. Ι Εὐχαὶ καὶ Ὕμνοι*, Ἐπισημονικαὶ Πραγματεῖαι, Σειρὰ

volved in the publication of liturgical texts and the in-depth study of the various aspects of divine worship.

As for the third direction of his liturgical interests and visions, he gave great importance to communication and contact with the people of God in general and especially with the priests, who have the responsibility of their pastoral care and liturgical education. Apart from the homilies in public in many Metropolises of the Church of Greece, but also abroad, he continued the dialogue with the priests on liturgical issues that had started in the year 1964 in the periodical, *Ὁ Ἐφημέριος*. The content of this dialogue, which was done with much love for the priests and gave solutions, of historical and theological importance, to important and difficult liturgical questions, has been published in five volumes under the title, *Answers to Liturgical Questions*.[73]

The combination of academic research with pastoral liturgical training and education was also reflected in the Liturgical and Hagiological Conferences for which he had the main responsibility. From the relevant volumes that have been published, their significance and importance can be affirmed. From 1991, an excellent collaboration began with the metropolitan of Drama, Dionysios of blessed memory,[74] at the Holy Monastery of Eikosiphoinissa,[75] which lasted until 2005, resulting in the organization of ten liturgical conferences in the presence of the priests of this local church. From these conferences, eight volumes were published with important introductions by both Iōannēs Phountoulēs and other professors and his collaborators. Indeed, in some of these volumes, parts of the work of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki from the 155th volume of the *Patrologia Graeca*, the edition of Dositheos of Jerusalem in Iaşi of Moldavia in

---

Φιλολογικὴ καὶ Θεολογική 10 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἑταιρεία Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν, 1968).

73. For a more general assessment of this monumental work, see K. Καραϊσαρίδης (Πρωτοπρ.), "Ὁ λειτουργιολόγος Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης μέσα ἀπὸ τὸ ἔργο του: Ἀπαντήσεις εἰς Λειτουργικὰς Ἀπορίας," in *Ἀναβαθμοὶ Λειτουργικῆς Ζωῆς*, K. Καραϊσαρίδης (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Ἀθ. Σταμούλης, 2007), 107–169.

74. Dionysios II of Drama (Διονύσιος), (1923–2005, r. 1965–2005).

75. "Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Εἰκοσιφοινίσσης."

1683, and the *Codex Zagora 23* are published in a critical edition, with translation and comments. Even after his retirement from the University (August 31, 1996), henceforth as professor emeritus, he not only continued his research activity with the same zeal, but also his contribution to the Church.

In the year 1998, he organized the first hagiological scholarly conference in his personal fatherland, Mytilene, in honor of Saint Theodōros of Byzantium the New Martyr. Another two followed, one in the year 2003 for Saint Andreas, Archbishop of Crete, the Jerusalemite and patron saint of Eresos in Lesbos,[76] and one in the year 2005 for Saint Grēgorios, Bishop of Assos the Wonderworker. And of the three Conferences, the volumes of which have been published, Iōannēs Phountoulēs of blessed memory was the soul and mastermind.

From the year 1999, the Church of Greece, within the framework of the initiatives of the Archbishop of Athens and All Greece, Christodoulos of blessed memory,[77] for the rekindling of liturgical life and the updating on liturgical matters for the rank and file of the Church of Greece, began a remarkable and pioneering attempt to organize Panhellenic Liturgical Symposia. Twelve symposia have already been held with the blessing of the Sacred Synod of the Church of Greece and the responsibility of the Special Synod Committee for Liturgical Renewal. Iōannēs Phountoulēs was also again, at least in the eight in which he took part, a constant support and a valuable advisor.

Indicative of his recognition by the Church and society is also the fact that the Ecumenical Patriarchate honored him with the offikion of Archōn Chartoularios[78] and entrusted him, from 1989, and nearly for fifteen years, with the direction of the Patriarchal Foundation for Patristic Studies.[79] During his time as Director, the series, "Λειτουργικὰ Βλατάδων," was launched. Thus, were published

76. A village in the southwest of the island of Lesbos.

77. Chrystodoulos (Χριστόδουλος) Archbishop of Athens and All Greece (1939-2008, r. 1998–2008).

78. "Ἄρχων Χαρτουλάριος."

79. "Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν."

*Typikon* (1994) by Fr. Geōrgios Rēgas the oikonomos of Skiathos and spiritual descendant of the Kollybades,[80] *Questions of the Typikon* (1999) by the same learned clergyman and author,[81] and the work, *The Ancient and Contemporary Liturgies of the Major Churches of Christ*, of the learned hierarch, Ambrosios Stavrinos.[82] Likewise, the series, "Ψαλτικὰ Βλατάδων," was also started (1998), the journal, *Ὀρθοδοξία*, was republished, and the question of the regular publication of the scholarly journal, *Κληρονομία*, was settled.

Iōannēs Phountoulēs was also the recipient of other distinctions, such as the award of the medal of the Apostle Paul on the part of the Church of Greece, and the nomination of him to an honorary doctorate by the Theological School of Belgrade in the year 2003. His address during this official ceremony had the title, "Liturgics: The Scholarship of Divine Worship."[83] From the year 1989, the Holy Monastery of Simōnos Petras entrusted him with the introductory commentary and the supervision of the remarkable effort of publishing volumes, such as the Hieratikon, the Sylleitourgikon, the Proestōtikon, and certain texts from the "Great Euchologion." These texts, small in size, excellent in appearance, and edited according to traditional criteria, have been favorably received by interested parties, and constitute an example of a contemporary, careful, and serious publication of the liturgical books.

---

80. Γεώργιος Ρήγας, ed., *Τυπικόν*, Λειτουργικὰ Βλατάδων 1 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1994). Geōrgios Rēgas (1884–1961), a native of Skiathos, studied there and in Athens, was ordained in 1920, exercised pastoral and teaching responsibilities, and was eventually honored with the ecclesiastical office of oikonomos. His scholarship included special studies focused on the liturgical life of Skiathos and extensive works dealing with the Typikon. See the discussion of Phountoulēs (7–10) in the introduction to the latter work.

81. Γεώργιος Ρήγας, *Ζητήματα Τυπικοῦ*, Λειτουργικὰ Βλατάδων 2, 2nd ed. (Ἀθῆναι: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1999).

82. Ἀμβρόσιος Σταυρινός, *Αἱ ἀρχαιόταται καὶ αἱ σύγχρονοι λειτουργίαι τῶν κυριωτέρων τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησιῶν*, Λειτουργικὰ Βλατάδων 4, 2nd ed. (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 2001). Ambrosios Stavrinos (1854–1931) after serving in several sees as a hierarch, including Neocaesarea, ended his career as Metropolitan of Derkoi (r. 1929–1931).

83. "Λειτουργική: Ἡ ἐπιστήμη τῆς θείας Λατρείας."

He also made a similar contribution to the publication by the Sacred Monastery of Pantokratoros of Holy Mountain of the book known from the twelfth century and intended for the private prayer of the eremitical fathers with the title, *Psalter with Troparia and Prayers, namely, A Type of Eremitic Vigil*, Holy Mountain, 2004.[84]

The Professor of blessed memory literally adored the Psalter. He always carried it in his pocket, studied it continually, and without exaggeration knew it by heart. Very often he interspersed his written or spoken word with similar psalm passages. "The earth is the Lord's and its fullness,"[85] he continually repeated. In the midst of the turmoil of life's problems, in taking care of the upbringing of his three children after the premature falling asleep of his beloved wife Helenē, and in the responsibility for his university and research duties, he drew strength from divine worship and indeed the Psalter. It was his daily rule like the old hermits and ascetics who studied and chanted the psalms "every day and night." Even during the period of his painful illness, when he "seemed nailed to the cross," he studied the Psalter by himself or had someone else read it to him.

On January 24, 2007 in the year of our Lord, the eve of the commemoration of Saint Grēgorios the Theologian, the Lord of life and death called him near Him in the tents of the righteous. The funeral service presided over by His Holiness Metropolitan Anthimos of Thessaloniki[86] was chanted on January 25 at the Cathedral of the Wisdom of God with the participation of many hierarchs and the presence of his colleagues, friends, and students. His All Holiness the Ecumenical Patriarch was represented by His Eminence Metropolitan Panteleēmōn of Tyroloē and Serention,[87] Emeritus Professor

84. Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, ed., *Ψαλτήριον μετὰ Τροπαρίων καὶ Εὐχῶν, ἤτοι τύπος κελλιωτικῆς Ἀγρυπνίας, ἐκ τοῦ κώδικος 43 τῆς Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Παντοκράτορος* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἔκδ. Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Παντοκράτορος, 2004).

85. Ps 23:1.

86. Ἄνθιμος (Anthimos) of Thessaloniki (b. 1934). In 2007, he was elected Metropolitan of Thessaloniki.

87. Panteleēmōn (Παντελεήμων) of Tyroloē and Serention (1929–2019, r. 1977–2019), taught canon law at the Theological School of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, was dean of the Saint Ioannēs of Damascus Institute of Theology of the University of Balamand in Syria, and abbot of the Monastery of Blatades (Μονὴ Βλατάδων).

of the Theological School of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, respected and beloved colleague of the departed one of eternal memory. The Sacred Synod of the Church of Greece was represented by His Eminence Metropolitan Daniēl of Kaisariani, Vyron, and Ymittos,[88] and President of the Special Synodal Committee for Liturgical Renewal. All those who attended and prayed together in the temple accompanied him to his final dwelling place in the municipal cemetery of the Resurrection of the Lord in Thermi,[89] with the prayer that his memory will be eternal and that his work will be highlighted and utilized as much as possible for the good of theological scholarship and of the fullness of the Church.

## Aspects of Positions and Proposals on Divine Worship—The Contribution to Liturgical Renewal

From what we have mentioned up until now regarding the studies, the academic career, the literary–scholarly work, and the social presence of the liturgiologist Iōannēs Phountoulēs of blessed memory, it becomes apparent that he was a personality with many gifts internationally recognized. Tireless spirit, pioneer, and exponent of the liturgical tradition, he left rich and original scholarly work and the memory of a wise and virtuous man. With his prudent and multifaceted activity, according to the late Professor Nikolaos Matsoukas, he taught us "scholarship and ethics."[90] According to the Archbishop Christodoulos of Athens and all Greece, of blessed memory, "he was a respected leading figure in the field of pan-Orthodox theology . . . he was an 'epistle of Christ,' a model of devotion to the history of our Church."[91] It has been very correctly written that "even after his death he inspires the Aristotelian mean, while his characteristic sim-

88. Daniēl (Δανιήλ) of Kaisariani, Vyron, and Ymittos (b. 1952). In 2000, he was elected of Metropolitan of Kaisariani, Vyron, and Ymittos.

89. "Θέρμη," a suburban town of Thessaloniki.

90. Νικόλαος Ματσούκας, *Μισοῦ αἰώνα ἔργα καὶ ὄνειρα στὸ Ἀριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἔκδ. Π. Πουρναρᾶ, 2003), 31. Nikolaos Matsoukas (Νικόλαος Ματσούκας) (1934–2006), professor of dogmatics and philosophy at the Theological School of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

91. *Ἐκκλησία* 84 (Φεβρουάριος 2007): 98.

plicity, which originated from an authentic personality and hid his traditional nobility, cannot be given over by his students, associates, and friends to the oblivion of time."[92]

Especially Iōannēs Phountoulēs, as a serious scholar of the liturgical sources, but also as a practical man, realistic and with great zeal regarding the "decently and in order"[93] of divine worship, as well as the experiential relationship of the believer with it, opened new paths in the discipline that served for decades. He spoke about the position of liturgical scholarship today, about the spirit of divine worship, and the role of clergy and laity in celebrations. He clarified what is tradition and what is innovation, criticized shortcomings with respect to the decorum of the temple, and studied the relationship between art and worship. He formulated proposals for contemporary liturgical issues, solved difficult liturgical–scholarly problems, pointed out various aberrations "that alter the correct liturgical tradition and the precise liturgical taxis of the Church,"[94] historically, theologically, and pastorally documented the issue of liturgical renewal, and defended the truth that "liturgical development is continued in practice."[95]

a. In the speech he delivered during the official ceremony of awarding him an honorary doctorate at the Theological School of Belgrade, among other things, he emphasized the following about liturgics as the scholarship of divine worship. This scholarship "comes as a humble helper, an assistant to the work of the Church, striving through research and knowledge, not, in any case, being puffed up, to be responsive to the divine work of the worship of the Church, by envisioning the correct, the traditional, the precise, the humanly

92. Κ. Καραϊσαρίδης, *Ἀναβαθμοὶ Λειτουργικῆς Ζωῆς* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Ἀθ. Σταμούλης, 2007), 195–196, 10.

93. 1 Cor 14:40.

94. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, *Λειτουργικὴ Α΄. Εἰσαγωγὴ στὴ θεία Λατρεία*, 4th edition (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 2004), 37.

95. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, *Λειτουργικὴ Α΄. Εἰσαγωγὴ στὴ θεία Λατρεία*, 4th edition (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 2004), 36.

perfect, the ideals of worship 'in spirit and truth' of the 'true worshipers' of the true God" (John 4:23–24).[96]

b. From the above, it is clear that "liturgics" deals with something alive and true, which nourishes the Christian life and brings humanity into communion with God and fellow beings. According to Iōannēs Phountoulēs, the spirit of divine worship is written and embodied in four main characters: the transcendental, the ascetic, the mystical, and the priestly. Namely, the Church continues the heavenly Liturgy on earth, of which Revelation makes mention.[97] "In this manner, humanity in divine worship rises above space and time and in the communion with God enjoys beforehand the bliss in the heavens. It praises and glorifies God. This is its only concern. Everything before the throne of God is silent."[98]

The above element, which has its roots in the apostolic era, was later enriched by the ascetic spirit originating from monastic worship and life. Elements such as fasting, the commemorations of ascetics and faithful in the Heortologion, the hymnological production, and the liturgical formality mainly after iconoclasm originates from the monastic liturgical form. "The new polity of the monks forever sought the achievement, far from the world, of that for which man was supremely called, perfection."[99] He certainly does not ignore that under the influence of social ideas and contemporary perspectives, the ascetic character of worship weakened and "the long monastic services were considered meaningless for human beings living in society, who were pressed by various distractions, to which they had to respond as exemplary members of society."[100]

The mystical element is also emphasized in divine worship since everything in Christ is a mystery. "A mystery whose manifestation

96. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, "Λειτουργική: Ἡ ἐπιστήμη τῆς θείας Λατρείας," *Ὀρθοδοξία*, περ. Β΄, 10, issue 4 (Ὀκτώβριος-Δεκέμβριος 2003): 914.

97. Rev 4 and 5.

98. "Τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς θείας Λατρείας" in *Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα Α΄*, Ιωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 1977), 18.

99. "Τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς θείας Λατρείας" in *Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα Α΄*, Ιωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 1977), 21.

100. "Τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς θείας Λατρείας" in *Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα Α΄*, Ιωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 1977), 32.

involves a redemptive character by liberating humanity in darkness through divine revelation and illuminating his/her mind through the knowledge of God."[101] For example, the tripartite division of the temple, the covering of vessels and vestments, the intense symbolism, the "inaudible" (μυστικῶς) reading of prayers is a result of this perception of the mystery as "hidden."[102] Iōannēs Phountoulēs does not deny the mystical character of divine worship. He points out, however, that the mystery of Christ was revealed to the world with His incarnation and is manifested daily in worship for the sanctification and salvation of humanity. This is why he is in favor of reciting the prayers within earshot; "the prayers are read without exaggeration in the recitation, modestly and with reverence, but as loud as possible to hear them."[103] The prayers are mystical on the level that the table is also mystical, the water of baptism is mystical, Mount Sinai is considered a mystical mountain, because all these precisely refer to the ascent of humanity and communion with God, an experience that cannot become comprehensible for the common mind. Therefore, the "within earshot" (εἰς ἐπήκοον) of the prayers does not contradict their mystical—mystagogical character. On the contrary, it assists in our most mystical participation in what is celebrated and is considered one of the conditions of preparation for our participation in the cup of the Divine Eucharist.

The fourth characteristic of divine worship is its priestly character. "No mystery or rite is performed without a priest. He alone enters the Holy of Holies. He draws near to the altar. He touches the vessels and the very Body of the Lord. He sanctifies himself and, full of grace and sanctification, comes forth in an instant as if from heaven to bless, sanctify, and impart grace to the people present."[104]

101. "Τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς θείας Λατρείας" in *Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα Α΄*, Ιωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 1977), 24.

102. "Τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς θείας Λατρείας" in *Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα Α΄*, Ιωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 1977), 25.

103. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, *Λειτουργικὴ Α΄. Εἰσαγωγὴ στὴ θεία Λατρεία*, 4th edition (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 2004), 207. See also *Ἀπαντήσεις εἰς Λειτουργικὰς Ἀπορίας* (Ἀθήνα: Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 2003), 5:186–203.

104. "Τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς θείας Λατρείας" in *Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα Α΄*, Ιωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 1977), 28.

These thoughts of his do not under any circumstances justify clericalist conceptions, since in his texts he is concerned with crucial questions about the position of the people in worship and the liturgical rights arising from baptism for the faithful.[105] Divine Worship unites the people of God, clergy and laity, in one body. "He asks for mercy and divine understanding for all . . . He prays and acts so that 'the scattered children of God' may gather 'into one' (John 11:52), to become one flock with one shepherd . . . In this way, he creates a countervailing force to the disruptive and divisive tendency of the world, which preys on its true unity in Christ and its renewal in the Holy Spirit."[106]

c. He did not see the issue of tradition and renewal in divine worship as polarizing, nor did he degrade it within the narrow framework of religious ideology. As for the first, since he recognizes the variety of formal traditions over time, he maintains that "tradition is not the attachment to the 'now' of liturgical life, nor to the imaginary ideal practice of a so-called apostolic age. But on the contrary, a dynamic stirring up of the entire liturgical life of the long centuries of tradition, an intense struggle for the Church's liturgical life today, if it is a genuine fruit of the long yesteryear, namely, of tradition."[107] With this meaning and dimension of tradition, diversity that unites is possible, but not permitted are disorder, arbitrariness, false piety, and confusion that consider taxis and tradition as disorder, and bad habits as tradition transcending the tradition of the Fathers.[108]

As for the second, renewal, it is considered an inherent element of traditional worship, which also evolves and, as historical research shows, is supplemented and renewed with criteria always pastoral.

---

105. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, "Οἱ λαϊκοὶ στὴν πράξη τῆς Ἐκκλησίας," *Κοινωνία* 34 (Ὀκτ.-Δεκ. 1991): 448-465.

106. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, "Τὸ ἑνοποιητικὸ ἔργο τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Λατρείας," *Κοινωνία* 33 (Ἀπρ.-Ἰούν. 1990): 252.

107. "Παράδοση καὶ θεία Λατρεία," in *Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα Ζ΄*, Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 1986), 41–42.

108. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, *Λειτουργικὴ Α΄. Εἰσαγωγὴ στὴ θεία Λατρεία*, 4th edition (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 2004), 37; idem., "Λειτουργική: Ἡ ἐπιστήμη τῆς θείας Λατρείας," *Ὀρθοδοξία*, περ. Β΄, 10, issue 4 (Ὀκτώβριος-Δεκέμβριος 2003): 914. See also Γ. Ν. Φίλιας, *Παράδοση καὶ ἐξέλιξη στὴ Λατρεία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθήνα: Ἔκδ. Γρηγόρη, 2006), 66, 97ff.

According to Iōannēs Phountoulēs, liturgical renewal aims at "how, namely, the people will understand what is celebrated, will actively participate in it, will chant together, will pray with the prayer of the Church 'in spirit and truth,' will attend church regularly, will approach with fear of God, faith, and love to the Divine Communion more regularly, will express the feasts with awareness, and will have the possibility to be carried from the sacred symbols to the transcendental and saving truths of our faith."[109]

d. Based on this relationship of tradition and renewal, the Professor of blessed memory did not refrain from making specific proposals for the addressing of corruptions that time and arbitrariness caused to the wonderful architectural monument which is—as he writes—the Divine Liturgy. This building, he emphasizes, "unfortunately, every kind of festoon, embellishments, and plastering distorted."[110] This is how he spoke and wrote, for example, regarding the maintenance of the correct psalmic antiphons in the Divine Liturgy, regarding the allēlouaria before the gospel, regarding the place of the sermon after the readings, regarding not omitting the ektenēs and the catechetical elements, regarding the communion psalm before and after Holy Communion, regarding (as we mentioned) the reading of the prayers and indeed of the anaphora within earshot, and regarding the chanting together and, especially, the participation of the people in the Holy Eucharist.[111]

He also took a clear position on several liturgical issues, which from time to time occupy and trouble the Church. For example, such issues are the problem of the common celebration of Pascha by Orthodox and non-Orthodox, the problem of fasts, the problem of the redistribution of the pericopes for the Sundays of the year, liturgical vestments, the position of women in divine worship, and above all the participation of the people in divine worship in general.

---

109. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, "Ἡ λειτουργικὴ ἀνανέωση στὴν Ὀρθόδοξο Ἐκκλησία. Δυνατότητες καὶ ἐμπόδια," *Κληρονομία* 21 (1989): 332.

110. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, *Περὶ μίαν μεταρρύθμισιν τῆς θείας Λειτουργίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 1961), 4.

111. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, *Περὶ μίαν μεταρρύθμισιν τῆς θείας Λειτουργίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 1961), 3–29; idem., *Λειτουργικὴ Α΄. Εἰσαγωγὴ στὴ θεία Λατρεία*, 4th ed. (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 2004), 286–287.

"It is unthinkable"—he writes—"for the people not to understand what is celebrated, for them not to share in the reasons for the prayer and the hymn, for them not to be edified from the abundance that is offered to them for edification and sanctification. In these cases, divine worship turns into 'empty phrases' (Matthew 6:7) or repels instead of attracting the believer."[112] Liturgical language is also connected with this topic, a problem regarding which he had been dealing for three whole years as a professor and in the context of the postgraduate program. He respected the traditional linguistic expression of worship. He also recommended serviceable translations for a better understanding of the meanings of the prayers and hymns.[113] He certainly considered it self-evident that "worship is performed in the language of the people, that which they understand and with that which they speak with their father—in this case God the Father—and his brothers."[114] However, he wanted everything to be done with seriousness and study by taking into account the historical data, the theological concerns, and the pastoral needs of the Church; and to deal with the issue. "If ever"—he points out—"the language ceases to be understandable, the Church must take action and deal with the issue."[115]

In any case, the issues related to divine worship are not imposed from above, but, as we also pointed out at the beginning of this text, they require patience, popular acceptance, and great respect for tradition. In addition, worship, according to Iōannēs Phountoulēs, is not approached arbitrarily and casually, but is interpreted through its texts. Therefore, any initiatives to settle liturgical issues require seriousness and documentation in the sources and texts. "Correct

112. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, *Σύγχρονα Λειτουργικὰ προβλήματα* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1993), 25–26.

113. These are the "Ἐγκόλπια" (Enkolpia), handbooks often containing translations into Modern Greek that are used by the faithful in order to follow liturgical services.

114. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, *Σύγχρονα Λειτουργικὰ προβλήματα* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1993), 27

115. Κ. Χουζούρης, "Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης: Ὁ ἀκαδημαϊκὸς δάσκαλος ποὺ συνέβαλε στὴν ἀνανέωση τῆς λειτουργικῆς ζωῆς," *Τόλμη* 11 (Σεπτέμβριος 2001): 21. See also Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, *Σύγχρονα Λειτουργικὰ προβλήματα* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1993), 28

liturgical education consists in the study and knowledge of the liturgical tradition, its letter and spirit."[116]

## Bibliography

The literary work of Iōannēs Phountoulēs from 1956 onwards is multifaceted and deals with research on liturgical, homiletical, hymnological, and hagiological topics. As for the latter, he is particularly involved with subjects regarding the local hagiological tradition of Lesbos. Among his publications are independent studies, the five volumes with answers to liturgical questions, the two-volume work with Lesbian and hagiological studies, the three-volume work with liturgical texts, and, in addition, the three-volume work recently published by the Apostolikē Diakonia with the title, *Τελετουργικὰ Θέματα* (*Ceremonial Topics*). There are also articles, which have not been collected in volumes, but have been published in the proceedings of conferences and scholarly journals. Indeed, some of these have been translated into English, French, Italian, Romanian, and Serbian. Iōannēs Phountoulēs edited the publication of liturgical texts, such as those of the Sacred Monastery of Simōnos Petras, and wrote quite a few prologues—introductions to works of liturgical interest and more. In addition, he wrote opinions, obituaries, numerous book reviews, as well as articles in Greek and foreign encyclopedias. He himself kept a file with the date of the writing and the year of publication for each of his texts. We consulted this file, with his blessing, in order to compile the present bibliography. We also took into account the work of Ath. Karathanasēs (ed.), *Bibliographic Guide. Publications of the Professors of the Theological School on the Fiftieth Anniversary of Its Foundation* (Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki—Theological School, 1992), pp. 178–187.[117] Especially for the book reviews published in the periodical, *Κληρονομία*, we

116. Ἰωάννης Μ. Φουντούλης, *Λειτουργικὴ Α΄. Εἰσαγωγὴ στὴ θεία Λατρεία*, 4th ed. (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 2004), 37.

117. Ἀθ. Καραθανάσης (ἐπιμ.), *Βιβλιογραφικὸς Ὁδηγός. Δημοσιεύματα Καθηγητῶν Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς ἐπὶ τῇ πεντηκονταετίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς ἱδρύσεώς της* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἀριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης–Θεολογικὴ Σχολή, 1992), 178–187.

relied on the "Index of Volumes 1 (1969) – 30 (1988) compiled by Adamantios St. Anestidēs," Thessaloniki vol. 33, issues 1–2, June–December 2001, pp. 147–152.[118] Indeed, at the behest and wish of the Professor of blessed memory, his publications are listed in thematic units with chronological order and new numbering internally. The first section contains the liturgical–homiletical, the second the hagiological–Lesbian, the third the prologues–introductions–studies–annals and opinions, the fourth the book reviews, the fifth the obituaries, and the last the articles in encyclopedias.

118. "Εὑρετήριον τόμων Α΄ (1969)–Λ΄ (1988) συνταχθὲν ὑπὸ Ἀδαμαντίου Στ. Ἀνεστίδη," *Κληρονομία* 33, issue 1–2 (Ἰούνιος-Δεκέμβριος 2001): 147–152.

## ΣΥΝΤΜΗΣΕΙΣ

| | |
|---|---|
| ΑΑ | «Ἀπόστολος Ἀνδρέας», Κωνσταντινούπολις. |
| ἄ.ἔ. | ἄνευ ἔτους. |
| ΓΠ | «Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς», Θεσσαλονίκη. |
| Ε | «Ἐκκλησία», Ἀθῆναι. |
| ΕΕΘΣΠΑ | «Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς Πανεπιστημίου Ἀθηνῶν». |
| ΕΕΘΣΠΘ | «Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης». |
| ΕΕΘΣΠΘ, ΤΠ | «Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης, Τμῆμα Ποιμαντικῆς». |
| Ελ | Ἑλληνικά. |
| ΕΣΧΘ | «Ἐπιστημονικὸν Συμπόσιον – Χριστιανικὴ Θεσσαλονίκη», Δῆμος Θεσσαλονίκης – Ἱ. Μονὴ Βλατάδων. |
| Εφ | «Ἐφημέριος», Ἀθῆναι. |
| Θ | «Θεολογία», Ἀθῆναι. |
| Κ | «Κοινωνία», Ἀθῆναι. |
| ΚΛ | «Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς». |
| Κλ | «Κληρονομία», Θεσσαλονίκη. |
| ΛΑΜ | «Λεσβιακὰ Ἁγιολογικὰ Μελετήματα», Μυτιλήνη. |
| ΛΔΕΛΜ | «Λεσβιακά», Δελτίον τῆς Ἑταιρείας Λεσβιακῶν Μελετῶν, Μυτιλήνη. |
| ΛΕ | «Λεσβιακὸν Ἑορτολόγιον». |
| ΛΘ | «Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα». |
| Ο | «Ὀρθοδοξία», Κωνσταντινούπολις-Θεσσαλονίκη. |
| ΟΕ | «Ὁ Ἐφημέριος», Ἀθῆναι. |
| ΟΠ | «Ὁ Ποιμήν», Μυτιλήνη. |
| ΟΠα | «Ὀρθόδοξος Παρουσία», Ἀθῆναι. |
| Π | «Παρουσία», Καβάλα. |
| ΠΕΣ | «Πρακτικὰ Ἐπιστημονικοῦ Συνεδρίου», Μυτιλήνη. |
| ΠΘΣΙΜΘ | «Πρακτικὰ Θεολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου Ἱ. Μητροπόλεως Θεσσαλονίκης». |
| ΠΙΣΙΜΔ | «Πρακτικὰ Ἱερατικοῦ Συνεδρίου Ἱ. Μητροπόλεως Δράμας». |
| ΠΛΣΙΜΘ | «Πρακτικὰ Λειτουργικοῦ Συνεδρίου Ἱ. Μητροπόλεως Θεσσαλονίκης». |
| ΠΠΛΣ | «Πρακτικὰ Πανελληνίου Λειτουργικοῦ Συμποσίου», Ἀθῆναι. |
| POC | «Proche – Orient Chrétien», Jerusalem. |
| σ. | σελίδα. |
| σσ. | σελίδες. |
| SC | Sources Chrétiennes, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris 1942 ἑξ. |
| Σ | «Σύναξη», Ἀθῆναι. |
| σχ. | σχῆμα. |
| τόμ. | τόμος. |
| ΤΘ | «Τελετουργικὰ Θέματα», Ἀθῆναι. |
| ΦΠ | «Ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ Ποιμένος», Καστοριά. |

## ΛΕΙΤΟΥΡΓΙΚΑ – ΟΜΙΛΗΤΙΚΑ

1. Λειτουργικαὶ σπουδαί. Λειτουργικαὶ διαλέξεις Ἁγίου Σεργίου Παρισίων 1958.
   *AA 8 (1958) No 368, σσ. 1.4.*
2. Ἡ λειτουργικὴ ἑβδομὰς τοῦ Mont-César (16-21 Ἰουλίου 1958).
   *AA 8 (1958) No 376, σ. 1. No 377, σ. 1, καὶ ΟΠ 23 (1958) 321-324.*
3. Λειτουργικὰ σημειώματα: [1. Ἡ ἕκτη ἑβδομὰς λειτουργικῶν σπουδῶν τοῦ Ἁγίου Σεργίου. 2. Ἡ λειτουργικὴ ἑβδομὰς τοῦ Mont-César (20-25 Ἰουλίου 1959). 3. Τὸ ἰωβηλαῖον τῆς Ρωμαιοκαθολικῆς λειτουργικῆς κινήσεως].
   *Θ 30 (1959) 686-697.*
4. A. Schmemann, Νηστεία καὶ λειτουργία. (Μετάφραση).
   *ΟΠ 24(1959) 60-62. 80-83. 147-149 καὶ 176-178.*
5. Ἡ βυζαντινὴ τέχνη ἐν Βελγίῳ.
   *ΟΠ 25(1960) 164-169.*
6. Περὶ μίαν μεταρρύθμισιν τῆς θείας Λειτουργίας.
   *ΓΠ 43(1960) 401-409 καὶ 444-456. Γαλλικὴ μετάφραση· POC 11 (1961) 49-56. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1961.*
7. Ἡ ἑβδόμη ἑβδομὰς λειτουργικῶν σπουδῶν τοῦ Ἁγίου Σεργίου.
   *Θ 32 (1961) 162-166.*
8. Ἡ λειτουργικὴ ἑβδομὰς τοῦ Mont-César (18-23 Ἰουλίου 1961).
   *Θ 32 (1961) 354-357.*
9. Τὸ ἐν Μονάχῳ λειτουργικὸν συνέδριον (31 Ἰουλίου-3 Αὐγούστου 1960).
   *Θ 32 (1961) 357-361.*
10. «Καιρὸς εἰσοδεύειν».
    *ΟΠ 26 (1961) 41 –43.*
11. «Χαῖρε Σιὼν ἁγία».
    *ΟΠ 26 (1961) 115-117.*
12. Κωνσταντίνου Καλλινίκου, Παρατηρήσεις ἐπὶ τῶν ψαλμικῶν καὶ παροιμιακῶν ἀναγνωσμάτων τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν λειτουργικῶν ἐντύπων πρὸς ἀμεμπτοτέραν αὐτῶν ἐκτύπωσιν, ἐκδίδεται ἐπιμελείᾳ Ἰ. Μ. Φουντούλη.
    *Ε 38 (1961) 69-73· 90-93. Ἀνάτυπον, Ἀθῆναι 1961.*

13. Αἱ μεγάλαι ὧραι τῆς Μεγάλης Πέμπτης, Μεγάλης Παρασκευῆς καὶ τοῦ Μεγάλου Σαββάτου (κατὰ τὸν ὑπ' ἀριθμ. 7 κώδικα τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἐθνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης).
*ΕΕΘΣΠΘ 7 (1962) 217-243. Ἀνάτυπον, Θεσσαλονίκη 1964.*

14. Ἡ εἰκοσιτετράωρος ἀκοίμητος δοξολογία (Διατριβὴ ἐπὶ διδακτορίᾳ), *Ἀθῆναι 1963.*

15. Μεγάλη Τεσσαρακοστὴ καὶ θεία Λατρεία.
*ΓΠ 47 (1964) 123-133, καὶ ΛΘ, Β΄, σσ. 7-22.*

16. Ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῇ θείᾳ Λατρείᾳ.
*ΕΕΘΣΠΘ 9 (1964) 355-376, καὶ ΛΘ, Α΄, σσ. 39-66.*

17. Τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς θείας Λατρείας.
*Ἀνάτυπο (ἐν μέρει), ΟΠΑ, Ἀθῆναι 1964, σσ. 78-91, καὶ ΛΘ, Α΄, σσ. 9-37.*

18. Τὸ λειτουργικὸν ἔργον Συμεὼν τοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης. (Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν καὶ θεωρίαν τῆς θείας Λατρείας), Διατριβὴ ἐπὶ ὑφηγεσίᾳ, *Θεσσαλονίκη 1965.*

19. Θεὸς καὶ ἱστορία κατὰ Συμεὼν τὸν Νέον Θεολόγον.
*«Θεὸς καὶ Ἱστορία», Θεσσαλονίκη 1966, σσ. 104-116, καὶ ΛΘ, Α΄, σσ. 99-116.*

20. Ἡ ἀκολουθία τοῦ Ὄρθρου.
*ΓΠ 50 (1966) 126-134· 212-221, καὶ ΛΘ, Η΄, σσ. 7-34. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1966.*

21. Ἡ Λειτουργία τῶν Προηγιασμένων καὶ αἱ εὐχαὶ τῶν ἀντιφώνων τοῦ Λυχνικοῦ.
*ΕΕΘΣΠΘ 11 (1967) 267-302. Ἀνάτυπον, ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ 1966.*

22. Ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς ἀναφορᾶς τοῦ ἁγίου Ἐπιφανίου Κύπρου.
*«Θεολογικὸν Συμπόσιον. Χαριστήριον εἰς τόν καθηγ. Π. Χρήστου», Θεσσαλονίκη 1967, σσ. 215-244. Ἀνάτυπον, Θεσσαλονίκη 1967 [= «Ἅγιος Ἐπιφάνιος Κωνσταντίας. Πατὴρ καὶ Διδάσκαλος τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας», Πρακτικὰ Συνεδρίου (Παραλίμνι, 8-11 Μαΐου 2008), Ἐπιμέλεια: Θεόδωρος Ξ. Γιάγκου, Πρωτοπρ. Χρυσόστομος Νάσσης, Ἁγία Νάπα – Παραλίμνι 2012].*

23. Συμεὼν ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης, Τὰ λειτουργικὰ συγγράμματα, τόμ. Ι, Εὐχαὶ καὶ ὕμνοι,
*Θεσσαλονίκη 1968, σσ. κδ΄ + 280.*

24. Βυζαντιναὶ λειτουργικαὶ «Κατηχήσεις». Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ὁμιλητικῆς.
*ΕΕΘΣΠΘ 12 (1967) 371-430. Ἀνάτυπον, Θεσσαλονίκη 1968.*

25. Ὁ σταθερὸς ἑορτασμὸς τοῦ Πάσχα ἀπὸ ὀρθοδόξου τελετουργικῆς πλευρᾶς (ἢ Ὁ συνεορτασμὸς τοῦ Πάσχα καὶ ἡ λειτουργικὴ πρᾶξις τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας).
*«Τὸ κοινὸν Πάσχα», Ἀθῆναι 1969, σσ. 61-65, καὶ ΛΘ, Ζ΄, σσ. 99-106.*

26. Λειτουργική, τεῦχος Ε΄, Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ Νυχθημέρου (Σημειώσεις πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν φοιτητῶν),
*Θεσσαλονίκη 1969.*

27. Τριθέκτη.
*ΚΛ 1, Θεσσαλονίκη ²1977.*

28. Παννυχίς.
*ΚΛ 2, Θεσσαλονίκη ²1977.*

29. Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ ἀποστόλου Μάρκου.
*ΚΛ 3, Θεσσαλονίκη ²1997.*

30. Χειροτονία Πρεσβυτέρου.
*ΚΛ 4, Θεσσαλονίκη ²1977.*

31. Θεία Λειτουργία Ἰακώβου τοῦ ἀδελφοθέου.
*ΚΛ 5, Θεσσαλονίκη ²1977.*

32. Αἱ μεγάλαι ὧραι τῆς παραμονῆς τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς.
*ΕΕΘΣΠΘ 16 (1971) 139-168. Ἀνάτυπον, Θεσσαλονίκη 1971.*

33. Λογικὴ Λατρεία.
*Θεσσαλονίκη 1971, καὶ Ἀθῆναι ²1984.*

34. Τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐν τῇ λειτουργικῇ ζωῇ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας.
*«Τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα», Θεσσαλονίκη 1971, σσ. 97-109, καὶ ΛΘ, Α΄, σσ. 67-85.*

35. Μοναχικὸς Ἑσπερινός.
*ΚΛ 6, Θεσσαλονίκη ²1977.*

36. Τάξις γινομένη ἐπὶ θεμελίῳ Ἐκκλησίας.
*ΚΛ 7, Θεσσαλονίκη ²1978.*

37. Λειτουργία Προηγιασμένων Δώρων.
*ΚΛ 8, Θεσσαλονίκη ²1978.*

38. Μεγάλαι ὧραι τῆς παραμονῆς τῆς ἁγίας Πεντηκοστῆς.
*ΚΛ 9, Θεσσαλονίκη ²1972.*

39. Μοναχικὸς Ὄρθρος.
*ΚΛ 10, Θεσσαλονίκη ²1978.*

40. Αἱ ἀκολουθίαι τῶν ὡρῶν τοῦ νυχθημέρου κατὰ τὸ Ὡρολόγιον τῆς Κρυπτοφέρρης ἐν συγκρίσει πρὸς τὸ Κωνσταντινουπολιτικὸν Ὡρολόγιον.
*«La Chiesa Greca in Italia», Padova 1973, σσ. 579-588.*

41. J. Mateos, Ἡ μικρὰ εἴσοδος τῆς θείας Λειτουργίας. (Μετάφραση).
*ΓΠ 56 (1973) 365-381.*

42. Συμπλήρωσις τοῦ δευτέρου τριωδίου τῆς Παρασκευῆς τῆς Τυροφάγου.
*Κλ 6 (1974) 351-356. Ἀνάτυπον, Θεσσαλονίκη 1974.*

43. Τὸ λειτουργικὸν ἔργον τοῦ ἱερέως.
*«Α΄ Ἱερατικόν Συνέδριον Ἱ. Μητροπόλεως Νεαπόλεως-Σταυρουπόλεως», 1975, σσ. 19-26, καὶ ΛΘ, Γ΄, σσ. 7-20.*

44. Μαρτυρίαι τοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης Συμεὼν περὶ τῶν Ναῶν τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης.
*ΕΕΘΣΠΘ 21(1976) 123-186, καὶ Ἀνάτυπον.*

45. Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα, Α΄ (1-5): [α΄) Τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς θείας Λατρείας, β΄) Ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῇ θείᾳ Λατρείᾳ, γ΄) Τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐν τῇ λειτουργικῇ ζωῇ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, δ΄) Ἡ Θεολογία ὡς ἐμπειρικὴ ἐπιστήμη, ε΄) Θεὸς καὶ ἱστορία κατὰ Συμεὼν τὸν Νέον Θεολόγον.],
*Θεσσαλονίκη 1977.*

46. Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα, Β΄(6-10): [ς΄) Μεγάλη Τεσσαρακοστὴ καὶ θεία Λατρεία, ζ΄) Τυπολογία τῆς Μεγάλης Τεσσαρακοστῆς, η΄) Ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκδηλουμένη ἐν τῇ ἐνανθρωπήσει τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου, θ΄) Οἱ ὁδοδεῖκτες τῆς Μεγάλης Τεσσαρακοστῆς, ι΄) Τριῴδιον καὶ Τριῴδια.],
*Θεσσαλονίκη 1977.*

47. Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα, Γ΄(11-15): [ια΄) Τὸ λειτουργικὸν ἔργον τοῦ ἱερέως, ιβ΄) Ὁ σύγχρονος εὐαγγελισμὸς τῶν πιστῶν, ιγ΄) Παράδοσις

καὶ ἀνανέωσις εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα, ιδ΄) Συμεὼν Θεσσαλονίκης, Περὶ θείου κηρύγματος, ιε΄) Εὐχαριστιακὴ νηστεία.],
*Θεσσαλονίκη 1977.*

48. Θεία Λειτουργία καὶ κόσμος.
*Θεσσαλονίκη 1977, καὶ ΛΘ, Δ΄, σσ. 53-72.*

49. Μία ἰδιόρρυθμος τάξις στιχολογίας τοῦ Ψαλτηρίου.
*ΚΛ 9 (1977) 77-87. Ἀνάτυπον, Θεσσαλονίκη 1977.*

50. Τυπολογία τῆς Μεγάλης Τεσσαρακοστῆς.
*ΓΠ 61(1978) 31-42 καὶ ΛΘ, Β΄, σσ. 23-38.*

51. Ἀκολουθία τοῦ μικροῦ Ἁγιασμοῦ.
*ΚΛ 11, Θεσσαλονίκη 1978.*

52. Βυζαντιναὶ θ. Λειτουργίαι Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου καὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου.
*ΚΛ 12, Θεσσαλονίκη 1978.*

53. Θεία Λειτουργία τῶν «Ἀποστολικῶν Διαταγῶν».
*ΚΛ 13, Θεσσαλονίκη 1978.*

54. Ἀκολουθία εἰς φόβον σεισμοῦ.
*ΚΛ 14, Θεσσαλονίκη 1978.*

55. Ἀκολουθία τοῦ Εὐχελαίου.
*ΚΛ 15, Θεσσαλονίκη 1978.*

56. Εἰκοσιτετράωρον Ὡρολόγιον
*ΚΛ 16, Θεσσαλονίκη 1978.*

57. Τὸ λειτουργικὸ ἔργο τοῦ Μεγάλου Βασιλείου.
*ΦΠ 29(1979) 5-9.24.*

58. Μία ἐπέτειος· 550 ἔτη ἀπὸ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης Συμεὼν (+Σεπτέμβριος 1429).
*ΓΠ 62(1979) 291-298. Ἀνάτυπον, Θεσσαλονίκη 1979.*

59. Ἡ θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ Μεγάλου Βασιλείου.
*«Βασιλειάς», Θεσσαλονίκη 1979, σσ. 255-275, καὶ ΛΘ, Δ΄, σσ. 23-52. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1979.*

60. Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα, Δ΄ (16-20): [ις΄) Χριστούγεννα-Θεοφάνεια, ιζ΄) Ἡ θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ Μεγάλου Βασιλείου, ιη΄) Θεία Λειτουργία καὶ κόσμος, ιθ΄) Ὁ ἅγιος Ἰωάννης τῆς «Κλίμακος» διδάσκαλος τῆς προσευχῆς, κ΄) «Πάσχα Κυρίου».],
*Θεσσαλονίκη 1979.*

61. «Μεγάλη Ἑβδομὰς» τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου.
*ΚΛ 17, Θεσσαλονίκη 1979.*

62. Θεία Λειτουργία τῆς Ἀρμενικῆς Ἐκκλησίας.
*ΚΛ 18, Θεσσαλονίκη 1979.*

63. Λειτουργία Προηγιασμένων Δώρων Ἰακώβου τοῦ Ἀδελφοθέου.
*ΚΛ 19, Θεσσαλονίκη 1979.*

64. Ἀκολουθία τοῦ Μνημοσύνου.
*ΚΛ 20, Θεσσαλονίκη 1979.*

65. Τὸ «Πάσχα» τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου.
*ΓΠ 63(1980) 197-202, καὶ ΛΘ, Ε΄, σσ. 49-58.*

66. Παράδοση καὶ θεία Λατρεία.
*«Τόμος ἑόρτιος Μ. Βασιλείου», Θεσσαλονίκη 1981, σσ. 11-24, καὶ ΛΘ, Ζ΄, σσ. 27-44.*

67. Περὶ συστάσεως ἑορτῆς εἰς μνήμην τῆς Β΄ καὶ ΣΤ΄ Οἰκουμενικῆς Συνόδου ἐπὶ τῇ 1600ῇ καὶ 1300ῇ ἐπετείῳ ἀπὸ τῆς συγκλήσεως αὐτῶν.
*ΓΠ 64 (1981) 16-24, καὶ ΛΘ, ΣΤ΄, σσ. 85-97.*

68. Λειτουργικὸν Βοήθημα. Λειτουργικὸν Συνέδριον Ἱ. Μητροπόλεως Θεσσαλονίκης εἰς τιμὴν καὶ μνήμην τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης Συμεὼν (1416/17-1429),
*Θεσσαλονίκη 1981.*

69. Ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θεσσαλονίκης Συμεών, νέος ἅγιος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μας.
*ΓΠ 64 (1981) 125-126, καὶ «Ἡμερολόγιον τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος» 1983, σσ. 27-28.*

70. Ἀπόστολος Παῦλος καὶ Φίλιπποι.
*Π 7 (1981) 98-102, καὶ ΛΘ, Ε΄, σσ. 37-48.*

71. Λειτουργικὴ (Πανεπιστημιακαὶ Παραδόσεις), ἐκδοτικὸς οἶκος Ἀφῶν Κυριακίδη,
*Θεσσαλονίκη 1981.*

72. Ἡ μνήμη τῶν ἁγίων Πατέρων τῆς Β΄ Οἰκουμενικῆς Συνόδου στὸ ἑορτολόγιο καὶ στὴν ὑμνογραφία.
*ΓΠ 66 (1983) 61-79 καί ΛΘ, ΣΤ΄, σσ. 59-84. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1983.*

73. Ὁ ἅγιος Συμεὼν Θεσσαλονίκης συντάκτης Τυπικοῦ.

*ΠΛΣΙΜΘ, 1983, σσ. 107-120, καὶ ΛΘ, ΣΤ΄, σσ. 9-26. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1983.*

74. Ὁ ἅγιος Συμεὼν Θεσσαλονίκης συγγραφεὺς εὐχῶν.
*ΠΛΣΙΜΘ, 1983, σσ. 121-130, καὶ ΛΘ, ΣΤ΄, σσ. 27-40. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1983.*

75. Ὁ ἅγιος Ἰωάννης τῆς «Κλίμακος» διδάσκαλος τῆς προσευχῆς.
*«Ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Σιναΐτου, Κλῖμαξ», Ἀθῆναι 1983, σσ. 465-482, καὶ ΛΘ, Δ΄, σσ. 73-89.*

76. Τὰ λειτουργικὰ βιβλία τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας.
*«Ἱερὰ Μητρόπολις Γερμανίας. Ἡμερολόγιο 1984», σσ. 21-22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, καὶ ΛΘ, Ε΄, σσ. 59-78.*

77. Νικόλαος Καβάσιλας ὁ μυσταγωγός.
*ΠΘΣΙΜΘ, 1984, σσ. 133-154, καὶ ΛΘ, Θ΄, σσ. 7-39. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1984.*

78. Ἑρμηνεία ἑπτὰ δυσκόλων σημείων τοῦ κειμένου τῆς θείας Λειτουργίας ἀπὸ τὸν Νικόλαο Καβάσιλα.
*ΠΘΣΙΜΘ, 1984, σσ. 157-172, καὶ ΛΘ, Θ΄, σσ. 41-66. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1984.*

79. Ἡ θεία Λειτουργία τῶν «Ἀποστολικῶν Διαταγῶν».
*ΓΠ 67 (1984) 12-21, καὶ ΛΘ, Ε΄, σσ. 7-21.*

80. Οἱ Χαιρετισμοὶ τῆς Παναγίας.
*ΓΠ 67 (1984) 80-88, καὶ ΛΘ, Ε΄, σσ. 7-21.*

81. Δυνατότητες–πλαίσια δράσεως τῆς ἐνορίας.
*Κ 28 (1985) 56-67, καὶ ΛΘ, ΣΤ΄, σσ. 41-58.*

82. Ὁ ἅγιος Δημήτριος στὴν ὑμνογραφία.
*ΓΠ 68 (1985) 165-181, καὶ ΛΘ, Ζ΄, σσ. 45-68. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1985.*

83. Ἡ «Διάταξις τῆς θείας Λειτουργίας» τοῦ ἁγίου Φιλοθέου τοῦ Κοκκίνου.
*ΠΘΣΙΜΘ, 1986, σσ. 99-114, καὶ ΛΘ, Θ΄, σσ. 67-88.*

84. Οἱ ἅγιοι Κύριλλος καὶ Μεθόδιος στὸ ἑορτολόγιο καὶ στὴν ὑμνογραφία τῆς Ἑλλαδικῆς Ἐκκλησίας.
*ΠΘΣΙΜΘ, 1986, 195-214, καὶ ΛΘ, Θ΄, σσ. 89-116. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1986.*

85. Βασίλης Στογιάννος. Ὁ ὁμιλητὴς ἀπὸ τὸν ἄμβωνα.

*«Τιμὴ καὶ μνήμη Βασίλη Στογιάννου», Θεσσαλονίκη 1986, σσ. 34-39.*

86. Μετάφραση τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς καὶ Ὀρθόδοξη Λατρεία.
*«Ἡ μετάφραση τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς στὴν Ὀρθόδοξη Ἐκκλησία», Θεσσαλονίκη 1986, σσ. 241-243.*

87. Λειτουργικὰ θέματα, Ε΄ (21-25): [κα΄) «Ἡ θεία Λειτουργία τῶν Ἀποστολικῶν Διαταγῶν», κβ΄) Οἱ Χαιρετισμοὶ τῆς Παναγίας, κγ΄) Ἀπόστολος Παῦλος καὶ Φίλιπποι, κδ΄) Τό «Πάσχα» τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου, κε΄) Τὰ λειτουργικὰ βιβλία τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας.],
*Θεσσαλονίκη 1986.*

88. Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα, ΣΤ΄ (26-30): [κς΄) Ὁ ἅγιος Συμεὼν Θεσσαλονίκης συντάκτης Τυπικοῦ, κζ΄) Ὁ ἅγιος Συμεὼν Θεσσαλονίκης συγγραφεὺς εὐχῶν, κη΄) Δυνατότητες - πλαίσια δράσεως τῆς ἐνορίας, κθ΄) Ἡ μνήμη τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων τῆς Β΄ Οἰκουμενικῆς Συνόδου στὸ ἑορτολόγιο καὶ στὴν ὑμνογραφία, λ΄) Περὶ τῆς συστάσεως ἑορτῆς εἰς μνήμην τῆς Β΄ καὶ ΣΤ΄ Οἰκουμενικῆς Συνόδου ἐπὶ τῇ 1600ῇ καὶ 1300ῇ ἐπετείῳ ἀπὸ τῆς συγκλήσεως αὐτῶν.],
*Θεσσαλονίκη 1986.*

89. Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα, Ζ΄ (31-35): [λα΄) Θεία Λατρεία καὶ Λειτουργικὴ στὴν Ἑλλάδα, λβ΄) Παράδοση καὶ Θεία Λατρεία, λγ΄) Ὁ ἅγιος Δημήτριος στὴν ὑμνογραφία, λδ΄) Τὰ δώδεκα Ἰδιόμελα τῶν μεγάλων ὡρῶν τῆς παραμονῆς τῶν Χριστουγέννων, λε΄) Ὁ σταθερὸς ἑορτασμὸς τοῦ Πάσχα ἀπὸ ὀρθοδόξου τελετουργικῆς πλευρᾶς.],
*Θεσσαλονίκη 1986.*

90. Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα, Η΄ (36-40): [λς΄) Ἡ ἀκολουθία τοῦ Ὄρθρου, λζ΄) Ἡ συμβολὴ τῶν Τριῶν Ἱεραρχῶν στὴ διαμόρφωση τῆς θείας Λατρείας, λη΄) Οἱ πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ ἔσχατοι, λθ΄) Ἡ θεία Λειτουργία καὶ οἱ νέοι, μ΄) Τὸ σημεῖο τοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ.],
*Θεσσαλονίκη 1987.*

91. Ἑσπερινὸς ὕμνος καὶ λογικὴ Λατρεία.
*ΓΠ 70 (1987) 15-20.*

92. Ἁγιορείτικη ἀγρυπνία.
*«Ἡ βυζαντινὴ μουσικὴ στοὺς νέους», Ν. Μουδανιὰ 1987, σσ. 13-16.*

93. Ἀρχαὶ (initia) τῶν Ὕμνων τοῦ ἁγίου Εὐσταθίου τοῦ Καταφλώρου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης.
*ΓΠ 71 (1988) 439-454.*

94. Τὸ ἀρχέτυπο τῆς Ὀρθοδοξίας τελειούμενο στὴ θεία Λατρεία.
*«Πρακτικὰ ΣΤ΄ Πανελληνίου Θεολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου», Ἀθῆναι 1988, σσ. 151-163. 179-183. 184-196, καὶ ΛΘ, Ι΄, σσ. 9-29.*

95. Ἡ Λειτουργικὴ στὸ πρόγραμμα τῶν σχολείων.
*Κ 31 (1988) 67-71, καὶ ΛΘ, Ι΄, σσ. 31-38.*

96. Ὁ ρόλος τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας στὴν Ἑνωμένη Εὐρώπη.
*Κλ 20 (1988) 289-293. Ἀνάτυπον, Θεσσαλονίκη 1992. Ἰταλικὴ μετάφραση· «Christianesimo e Cultura in Europa, Memoria, Coscienza, Progetto. Atti del Simposio presinodale», Vaticano 1991, σσ. 308-312.*

97. Ἡ μαθητικὴ θεία Λειτουργία.
*Κ 32(1989) 18-35, καὶ ΛΘ, Ι΄, σσ. 39-66.*

98. Ἰδιορρυθμίες τῆς λειτουργικῆς πράξεως τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης κατὰ τὶς ἀρχὲς τοῦ ΙΕ΄ αἰῶνος.
*ΕΣΧΘ, «Παλαιολόγειος ἐποχή», Θεσσαλονίκη 1989, σσ. 149-163. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1989.*

99. Ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος στὴ θεία Λατρεία.
*ΠΘΣΙΜΘ, 1989, σσ. 443-456, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Β΄, Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 23-40.*

100. Τοῦ ἁγίου Εὐσταθίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης τοῦ Καταφλώρου, Ὑμνογραφικά.
*ΠΘΣΙΜΘ, 1989, σσ. 443-456.*

101. Ἡ λειτουργικὴ ἀνανέωση στὴν Ὀρθόδοξο Ἐκκλησία. Δυνατότητες καὶ ἐμπόδια.
*Κλ 21 (1989) 325-334. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1992, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Β΄, Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 41-54.*

102. Τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου «Ὕμνος ἑσπερινός». – Ἡ λειτουργική του χρήση.
*Κλ 22 (1990) 245-271. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1993.*

103. Ὁ Ἀπόστολος Παῦλος στὸ ἑορτολόγιο.
*Κλ 22 (1990) 245-271. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1993, καὶ*

*Παῦλος. Πρῶτος μετὰ τὸν ἕνα [Κλάδος Ἐκδόσεων Ἐπικοινωνιακῆς καὶ Μορφωτικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος], Ἀθῆναι 2001, σσ. 389-410.*

104. Τὸ ἑορτολόγιο τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας – Ἡ γένεση καὶ διαμόρφωσή του.

*ΠΙΣΙΜΔ, «Χριστιανικὸν Ἑορτολόγιον», Δράμα 1990, σσ. 21-45, καὶ ΤΘ, Ἀθήνα 2002, σσ. 25-48.*

105. Μοναχικὸ καὶ κοσμικὸ τυπικό.

*«Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Μεταμορφώσεως – Μεγάλου Μετεώρου. 600ὴ Ἀμφιετηρίς. Πρακτικὰ Πανελληνίου Μοναστικοῦ Συνεδρίου (18-20 Ἀπριλίου 1990)», Ἅγια Μετέωρα 1990, σσ. 217-227. Ἀνάτυπο, Ἅγια Μετέωρα 1990, καὶ ΤΘ, Ἀθήνα 2002, σσ. 9-24.*

106. Τὸ ἑνοποιητικὸ ἔργο τῆς ὀρθοδόξου Λατρείας.

*Κ 33 (1990) 246-257. «Πρακτικὰ Δ΄ Ἐπιστημονικοῦ Συνεδρίου. Ἡ κοινωνικὴ διάσταση τοῦ ἔργου τῆς Ἐκκλησίας», Θεσσαλονίκη 1991, σσ. 49-56, καὶ ΛΘ, Ι΄, σσ. 67-83.*

107. Λειτουργικὲς ἰδιορρυθμίες τῶν ἀκολουθιῶν τῆς Μεγάλης Τεσσαρακοστῆς.

*«Ἀξίες καὶ Πολιτισμός, Ἀφιέρωμα στὸν Καθηγητὴ Εὐάγγελο Θεοδώρου», Ἀθήνα 1991, σσ. 207-236. Ἀνάτυπο, Ἀθήνα 1991, καὶ ΤΘ, Ἀθήνα 2002, σσ. 49-87.*

108. Ἡ θεία Μεταμόρφωσις. – Ὁ Χριστὸς Παντοκράτωρ.

*Κλ 23 (1991) 281-290. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1994.*

109. Ἡ ἑορτὴ καὶ ἡ ἀκολουθία τῶν Τριῶν Ἱεραρχῶν.

*ΓΠ 74 (1991) 699-716, καὶ «Ἕνωσις Θεολόγων Βορείου Ἑλλάδος, Ὁμιλίες – Διαλέξεις ἐπικαίρων θεμάτων», Θεσσαλονίκη 1992, σσ. 95-113.*

110. Πατέρες καὶ Μητέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας.

*«Οἰκοδομὴ καὶ Μαρτυρία», τόμ. Β΄, Κοζάνη 1991, σσ. 451-465. Ἀνάτυπο, Κοζάνη 1991.*

111. Ἡ συμβολικὴ γλώσσα τῆς θείας Λατρείας.

*ΠΙΣΙΜΔ, «Σύμβολα καὶ συμβολισμοὶ τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας», Δράμα 1991, σσ. 51-90, καὶ ΤΘ, Ἀθήνα 2002, σσ. 89-127.*

112. Οἱ λαϊκοὶ στὴν πράξη τῆς Ἐκκλησίας.
*Κ 34 (1991) 448-465, καὶ ΛΘ, Ι΄, σσ. 85-108.*

113. Τὸ ψηφιδωτὸ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου Θεσσαλονίκης μὲ τὴν παράσταση τῆς Παναγίας καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Θεοδώρου. (Προσπάθεια ἑορτολογικῆς ἑρμηνείας).
*Γ΄ ΕΣΧΘ, «Ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουστινιανείου ἐποχῆς ἕως καὶ τῆς Μακεδονικῆς Δυναστείας», Θεσσαλονίκη 1991, σσ. 175-184. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1991.*

114. Λειτουργικὴ ζωὴ (στὴ Σιμωνόπετρα).
*«Σιμωνόπετρα – Ἅγιον Ὄρος», Ἀθήνα 1991, σσ. 132-162. Ἀγγλικὴ μετάφραση· «Simonopetra», σσ. 132-162.*

115. Ἀναζωπύρωση τῆς ὑμνογραφίας καὶ ψαλτικῆς στὸ Ἅγιον Ὄρος.
*«Ἡ Καθημερινὴ – Ἑπτὰ ἡμέρες: Ἅγιον Ὄρος, ἡ κιβωτὸς τῆς Ὀρθοδοξίας», 5 Ἰουλίου 1992, σσ. 22-23.*

116. Ἡ θεία Λειτουργία.
*«Ἡ Ὀρθοδοξία σήμερα» (Κλείτου Ἰωαννίδη), τόμ. Α΄, Λευκωσία 1992, σσ. 338-342.*

117. Ἡ λειτουργικὴ παράδοση. Μιὰ πρώτη εἰκόνα τῶν ἰδιομορφιῶν τοῦ λειτουργικοῦ τυπικοῦ τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης.
*«Ἡ Καθημερινή – Ἑπτὰ ἡμέρες: Ἅγιον Ὄρος, ἡ κιβωτὸς τῆς Ὀρθοδοξίας», 25 Δεκεμβρίου 1992, σ. 6.*

118. Σύγχρονα λειτουργικὰ προβλήματα.
*Ε 69 (1992) 607-610. Ἀνάτυπο, Ἀθήνα 1993, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Β΄, Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 55-72.*

119. Περὶ τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς γνησιότητος τῶν λειτουργικῶν κειμένων.
*«Ἀντιπελάργησις», Τόμος τιμητικὸς πρὸς τὸν Ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Κύπρου κ.κ. Χρυσόστομον ἐπὶ τῇ εἰκοσιπενταετηρίδι τῆς ἀρχιερατικῆς αὐτοῦ διακονίας, Λευκωσία 1993, σσ. 569-584.*

120. Ἡ οἰκονομία σὲ λειτουργικὰ θέματα κατὰ τὸν Πατριάρχη Γεννάδιο Σχολάριο. – Ποιμαντικὲς ἀνάγκες τῆς Τουρκοκρατίας.
*Ε΄ ΕΣΧΘ, «Ὀθωμανικὴ περίοδος 1453-1912, Α΄», Θεσσαλονίκη 1993, σσ. 175-202. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1993.*

121. Ἡ γυναίκα στὴ λειτουργικὴ ζωὴ καὶ ἐνοριακὴ διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας.

*ΕΕΘΣΠΘ, ΤΠ, 3 (1993) 89-99. «Διορθόδοξον Θεολογικὸν Συνέδριον, Ρόδος, 30/10-7/11/1988», Κατερίνη 1994, σσ. 295-307. Ἀγγλικὴ μετάφραση «The place of the woman in the Orthodox Church and the question of the ordination of women», σσ. 197-206, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Β΄, Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 9-22.*

122. Θεία Λειτουργία.

*«Ἐγκόλπιο Ἡμερολόγιο Ἱ. Μητροπόλεως Βελγίου», Βρυξέλλαι 1994, σσ. 19-28, καὶ «Πρὸς Ἱερέα», Ἱ. Ἡσυχαστήριον Ἁγίου Γρηγορίου Παλαμᾶ, Κουφάλια Θεσσαλονίκης, 5 (1997) 6-7.*

123. Ὁ ἅγιος Συμεὼν Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θεσσαλονίκης († 1429).

*«Ἑλληνικὴ Πατρολογία (J.P. Migne, Patrologia Graeca)», τόμ. 155, Ἀθῆναι 1994, σσ. ϑ΄ - ιϑ΄. Κέντρον Πατερικῶν Ἐκδόσεων (ΚΕΠΕ).*

124. Ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ.

*«Εἰκοσαέτηρος Ἀρχιερατεία Μητροπολίτου Πατρῶν Νικοδήμου Α΄, 1974-1994», σσ. 168-176.*

125. Τελετουργικὰ προβλήματα τῶν ἀκολουθιῶν τοῦ νυχθημέρου.

*ΠΙΣΙΜΔ, «Οἱ ἀκολουθίες τοῦ νυχθημέρου», Δράμα 1994, σσ. 123-124, καὶ ΤΘ, Ἀθήνα 2002, σσ. 129-146.*

126. Ἡ θεία Λειτουργία Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου. Εἰσαγωγικὰ προβλήματα.

*«Μνήμη ἁγίων Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου καὶ Μεγάλου Φωτίου Ἀρχιεπισκόπων Κωνσταντινουπόλεως». Πρακτικὰ Ἐπιστημονικοῦ Συμποσίου. Κέντρο Βυζαντινῶν Ἐρευνῶν, Θεσσαλονίκη 1994, σσ. 179-198. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1994.*

127. Ἡ σημασία τῶν ὑδάτων – Μιὰ μυστηριακὴ ἑρμηνεία.

*Κλ 27 (1995) 109-117. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1996. Ἀγγλικὴ μετάφραση· «The significance of water: A mystical interpretation», Revelation and the environment: AD 95-1995, ἐπιμ. Sarah Hobson καὶ Jane Lubchenco, Λονδίνο 1997, σσ. 54-58.*

128. Περὶ τῶν περικοπῶν τοῦ κατὰ Λουκᾶν Εὐαγγελίου.

*«Δίπτυχα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος», 1996, σσ. πγ΄-ργ΄.*

129. Θεία Λατρεία καὶ τέχνη. Σχέσεις λατρείας καὶ τεχνῶν στὸν ὀρθόδοξο ναό.

*Ο, Β΄ 3 (1996) 223-232, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Β΄, Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 73-85.*

130. Τὸ ἅγιον Βάπτισμα. Ἱστορικο-τελετουργικὴ θεώρηση.
*ΠΙΣΙΜΔ, «Τὸ ἅγιον Βάπτισμα», Δράμα 1996, σσ. 183-232. «Ποιμαντικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη 2», Ἀθῆναι 1999 (σσ. 62) καὶ ΤΘ, Ἀθήνα 2002, σσ. 165-208.*

131. Λειτουργικὲς δυσκολίες γιὰ ἕνα κοινὸ οἰκουμενικὸ ὅραμα: Ἡ περίπτωση Ὀρθοδόξων-Προχαλκηδονίων.
*Ο, Β΄ 4 (1997) 101-108.*

132. Τὸ «Πάσχα» τῶν Χριστουγέννων.
*Ο, Β΄ 4 (1997) 482-497, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Β΄, Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 101-121.*

133. Ἡ ἱερολογία τοῦ Γάμου. Ἱστορικο-τελετουργικὴ θεώρηση.
*ΠΙΣΙΜΔ, «Τὸ ἱερὸν μυστήριον τοῦ γάμου», Δράμα 1997, σσ. 221-261, καὶ ΤΘ, Ἀθήνα 2002, σσ. 225-261.*

134. Ἀξιολογία τῆς Λατρείας (καθηγητὴς Εὐάγγελος Θεοδώρου).
*«Ἐπίσημοι Λόγοι», Ἐθνικὸ καὶ Καποδιστριακὸ Πανεπιστήμιο Ἀθηνῶν, τόμ. 30 (1997) 1223-1226.*

135. Ὁ ἀπόστολος Ἀνδρέας ὁ Πρωτόκλητος στὴν ὑμνογραφία – Δειγματολογικὴ προσέγγιση.
*«Πρωτοκλήτεια 1996», «Πρωτοκλήτεια 1997», – Ἱερὰ Μητρόπολις Πατρῶν, Ἀθῆναι 1998, σσ. 145-162. Ἀνάτυπον, Ἀθῆναι 1998.*

136. Ἡ θεία Λειτουργία. Τελετουργικὴ θεώρηση.
*ΠΙΣΙΜΔ, «Ἡ θεία Λειτουργία», Δράμα 1998, σσ. 135-170. Ἱ. Μητρόπολις Νεαπόλεως καὶ Σταυρουπόλεως, Νεάπολη Θεσσαλονίκης 2001, σσ. 38, καὶ ΤΘ, Ἀθήνα 2002, σσ. 236-294.*

137. Ὀρθόδοξη γυναίκα καὶ Λατρεία.
*Ο, Β΄, 5 (1998) 698-706, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Β΄, Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 87-99.*

138. Διάλογος Ὀρθοδόξων – Προχαλκηδονίων. 1. Λειτουργικὰ δημοσιεύματα. 2. Κύριαι λειτουργικαὶ θέσεις.
*Ο, Β΄, 6 (1999) 200-211.*

139. Ἡ μυστηριακὴ ζωὴ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας καὶ τὰ Μέσα Μαζικῆς Ἐνημέρωσης.

*Ε 77 (2000) 107-112, καὶ ΤΘ, Ἀθήνα 2002, σσ. 209-224.*

140. Ἡ Θεσσαλονίκη ὡς λατρευτικὴ ἕδρα τῆς Ἱερᾶς Ἐπαρχιακῆς Μητροπολιτικῆς Συνόδου καὶ οἱ ναοὶ τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης κατὰ τὸν Θεσσαλονίκης Συμεών.

*ΙΓ' ΕΣΧΘ, «Ἡ Ἐπαρχιακὴ Μητροπολιτικὴ Σύνοδος Θεσσαλονίκης», Θεσσαλονίκη 2000, σσ. 169-178.*

141. Ἡ ἀναγκαιότης τοῦ κηρύγματος ἐν τῇ θείᾳ Λατρείᾳ κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Νεκτάριον.

*«Ὁ ἅγιος Νεκτάριος ὁ πνευματικός, ὁ μοναστικός, ὁ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἡγέτης». Πρακτικὰ Διορθοδόξου Θεολογικοῦ Ἐπιστημονικοῦ Συνεδρίου ἐπὶ τῇ ἑκατονπεντηκονταετηρίδι (1846-1996) ἀπὸ τῆς γεννήσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Νεκταρίου (Αἴγινα 21-23 Ὀκτωβρίου 1996), Ἀθῆναι 2000, σσ. 249-263.*

142. Τὸ λειτουργικὸν ἔργον τοῦ ἁγίου Νεκταρίου.

*«Ὁ ἅγιος Νεκτάριος ὁ πνευματικός, ὁ μοναστικός, ὁ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἡγέτης». Πρακτικὰ Διορθοδόξου Θεολογικοῦ Ἐπιστημονικοῦ Συνεδρίου ἐπὶ τῇ ἑκατονπεντηκονταετηρίδι (1846-1996) ἀπὸ τῆς γεννήσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Νεκταρίου (Αἴγινα 21-23 Ὀκτωβρίου 1996), Ἀθῆναι 2000, σσ. 265-278.*

143. Τὸ μυστήριο τοῦ Εὐχελαίου. Τελετουργικὴ θεώρηση.

*ΠΙΣΙΜΔ, «Τὸ ἱερὸν μυστήριον τοῦ Εὐχελαίου», Δράμα 2000, σσ. 177-202, καὶ ΤΘ, Ἀθήνα 2002, σσ. 319-342.*

144. Τοῦ ἁγίου Συμεὼν ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης. Περὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς τελετῆς τοῦ ἁγίου ἐλαίου. Εἰσαγωγὴ – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια.

*ΠΙΣΙΜΔ, «Τὸ ἱερὸν μυστήριον τοῦ Εὐχελαίου», Δράμα 2000, σσ. 217-264.*

145. Λειτουργικὰ στοιχεῖα στὸ ὁμιλητικὸ ἔργο τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ.

*«Ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς στὴν ἱστορία καὶ τὸ παρόν». Πρακτικὰ Διεθνῶν Ἐπιστημονικῶν Συνεδρίων Ἀθηνῶν καὶ Λεμεσοῦ», Ἱερὰ Μεγίστη Μονὴ Βατοπαιδίου, Ἅγιον Ὄρος 2000, σσ. 349-363. Ἀνάτυπον, Ἅγιον Ὄρος 2000.*

146. Ἡ Μεγάλη Τεσσαρακοστὴ καὶ ὁ σύγχρονος ἄνθρωπος.

*Ο, Β΄ 7 (2000) 121-131, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Β΄, Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 145-160.*

147. Ἡ ἀναβίωση τοῦ ἀσματικοῦ τυπικοῦ. Ἀκολουθία τῆς Τριθέκτης.

*Ἐφ Ἰούλιος 2000, σσ. 22-23. Αὔγουστος 2000, σσ. 22-23, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Β΄, Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 137-144.*

148. Ἁγιορειτικὰ λειτουργικὰ Τυπικά.

*«Ἅγιον Ὄρος. Φύση – Λατρεία – Τέχνη». Πρακτικὰ Συνεδρίων, τόμ. Α΄, Θεσσαλονίκη 2001, σσ. 343-351, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Β΄, Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 123-135.*

149. Nikodemo l' Aghiorita e la Theologia Liturgica.

*E. Citterio, O. Clément, E. N. Phranghiskos e AA. VV., «Nikodemo l' Aghiorita e la Filocalia». Edizioni Qiquajon, Comunità di Bose 2001, σσ. 181-191.* Ἑλληνικὸ κείμενο: «Ὁ ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης καὶ ἡ λειτουργικὴ θεολογία», στὸ *Ἀντίδωρον τῷ Μητροπολίτῃ Μεσσηνίας Χυσοστόμῳ Θέμελῃ, τόμ. Α΄, Καλαμάτα 2006, σσ. 189-198.*

150. Ὁ ἱερέας ὡς μυσταγωγός.

*«Ὁ ἱερέας ὡς ποιμένας καὶ λειτουργός». Α΄ Ἱερατικὸ Συνέδριο, ἔκδ. Ἱ. Ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς Κύπρου, 2001, σσ. 29-38, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Β΄, Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 161-170.*

151. Ὁ Εὐαγγελισμὸς τῆς Θεοτόκου. Ἡ ἑορτὴ τῆς σαρκώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου στὴ θεία Λατρεία τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας.

*«Ἀνθηφόρος Μητροπολίτου Δέρκων Κωνσταντίνου», Ἀθήνα 2001, σσ. 484-501.*

152. Τὰ ἱερὰ Μνημόσυνα.

*ΠΙΣΙΜΔ, «Νεκρώσιμα Τελετουργικά», Δράμα 2001, σσ. 241-262, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Γ΄, Ἀθήνα 2007, σσ. 27-46.*

153. Τοῦ ἁγίου Συμεὼν ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης, Περὶ τοῦ τέλους ἡμῶν καὶ περὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς τάξεως τῆς κηδείας καὶ τῶν κατ' ἔθος ὑπὲρ μνήμης γινομένων. Εἰσαγωγὴ – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια.

*ΠΙΣΙΜΔ, «Νεκρώσιμα Τελετουργικά», Δράμα 2001, σσ. 309-363.*

154. Παράδοση καὶ ἀνανέωση στὸ κήρυγμα.

*Σ 83 (2002) 74-77 (ἀπὸ Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα Γ΄ (11-15), Θεσσαλονίκη 1977, σσ. 47-52).*

155. Τὸ Βάπτισμα τῶν ἐνηλίκων, ὁ νηπιοβαπτισμός, τὸ Βάπτισμα τῆς ἀνάγκης. Τελετουργικὴ θεώρηση.

*ΤΘ, Ἀθήνα 2002, σσ. 295-317. ΠΠΛΣ (Α'), «Τὸ ἅγιον Βάπτισμα», Ἀθῆναι 2003, σσ. 129-151.*

156. Τελετουργικὰ θέματα: [Α) Μοναχικὸ καὶ κοσμικὸ Τυπικό. Β) Τὸ ἑορτολόγιο τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας. Γ) Λειτουργικὲς ἰδιομορφίες τῶν ἀκολουθιῶν τῆς Μεγάλης Τεσσαρακοστῆς. Δ) Ἡ συμβολικὴ γλώσσα τῆς θείας Λατρείας. Ε) Τελετουργικὰ προβλήματα τῶν ἀκολουθιῶν τοῦ νυχθημέρου. ΣΤ) Νεκρώσιμα τελετουργικά. Ζ) Τὸ ἅγιον Βάπτισμα. Η) Ἡ μυστηριακὴ ζωὴ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας καὶ τὰ Μέσα Μαζικῆς Ἐνημέρωσης. Θ) Ἡ ἱερολογία τοῦ Γάμου. Ι) Ἡ θεία Λειτουργία. ΙΑ) Τὸ Βάπτισμα τῶν ἐνηλίκων, ὁ νηπιοβαπτισμός, τὸ Βάπτισμα τῆς ἀνάγκης. ΙΒ) Τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Εὐχελαίου].

*Σειρὰ «Λογικὴ Λατρεία» 12, ἐκδ. Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας, Ἀθήνα 2002, σσ. 343.*

157. Ἡ Θεσσαλονίκη ὡς λειτουργικὸ κέντρο κατὰ τὴν ἐποχὴ τῶν Παλαιολόγων.

*«Ἡ Μακεδονία κατὰ τὴν ἐποχὴ τῶν Παλαιολόγων», Ἀριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, Διεθνῆ Συμπόσια γιὰ τὴ Μακεδονία, Θεσσαλονίκη 14-20 Δεκεμβρίου 1992, Θεσσαλονίκη 2002, σσ. 581-586.*

158. [Ἐπιστολὲς Ἰ. Μ. Φουντούλη].

*Μεθοδίου Γ. Φούγια, Μητροπολίτου Πισιδίας, πρ. Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θυατείρων καὶ Μεγάλης Βρεττανίας, Θεολογικαὶ καὶ Ἱστορικαὶ Μελέται. Ἐπιλογὴ κριτικῶν καὶ ἀπόψεων στὶς ἐργασίες μου, τόμ. δέκατος ἕκτος, Ἀθῆναι 2002, σσ. 101, 149, 214, 694, 695, 744, 745.*

159. L' Eortologio del Sinai.

*Giovanni Climaco e il Sinai. Edizioni Qiquajon, Communità di Bose, 2002, σσ. 301-312.*

160. Παράδοση καὶ ἐξέλιξη τῶν ἱερῶν ἀμφίων.

*«Τὰ ἱερὰ ἄμφια καὶ ἡ ἐξωτερικὴ περιβολὴ τοῦ ὀρθοδόξου κλήρου». Σειρὰ «Ποιμαντικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη 5», Ἱ. Σύνοδος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Ἀθῆναι 2002, σσ. 63-76, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Β', Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 171-184.*

161. Σχόλια στὴν Ἀκολουθία τῆς Μετανοίας.

*ΠΙΣΙΜΔ, «Τὸ ἱερὸν Μυστήριον τῆς Μετανοίας», Δράμα 2002, σσ. 117-135, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Β΄, Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 71-86.*

162. Τοῦ ἁγίου Συμεὼν ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης, Περὶ Μετανοίας. Εἰσαγωγή – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια.
*ΠΙΣΙΜΔ, «Τὸ ἱερὸν Μυστήριον τῆς Μετανοίας», Δράμα 2002, σσ. 397-481.*

163. Οἱ Μακαρισμοὶ στὴν Ὀρθόδοξη Λατρεία.
*«Σύναξις Εὐχαριστίας. Χαριστήρια εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ Γέροντος Αἱμιλιανοῦ», Ἀθῆναι 2003, σσ. 655-668, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Β΄, Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 109-123.*

164. La memoria liturgica di san Simeone il Nuovo Theologo.
*I. Alfeev, K. P. Charalampidis, J. Chryssavgis, M. H. Congourdeau e AA.VV., Simeone il Nuovo Theologo e il monachesimo a Constantinopoli, Edizioni Qiquajon, Communità di Bose, 2003, σσ. 323-332, καὶ Ἀνάτυπο.*

165. Λειτουργική. Ἡ ἐπιστήμη τῆς θείας Λατρείας.
*Ο, Β΄ Ι΄(2003) 909-917.*

166. Ἀπαντήσεις εἰς Λειτουργικὰς Ἀπορίας, Α΄ (1-150), Ἀποστολικὴ Διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Ἀθήνα $^{6}$2006.

167. Ἀπαντήσεις εἰς Λειτουργικὰς Ἀπορίας, Β΄ (151-300), Ἀποστολικὴ Διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Ἀθήνα $^{5}$2006.

168. Ἀπαντήσεις εἰς Λειτουργικὰς Ἀπορίας, Γ΄ (301-400), Ἀποστολικὴ Διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Ἀθήνα $^{4}$2006.

169. Ἀπαντήσεις εἰς Λειτουργικὰς Ἀπορίας, Δ΄ (401-500), Ἀποστολικὴ Διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Ἀθήνα $^{2}$2006.

170. Ἀπαντήσεις εἰς Λειτουργικὰς Ἀπορίας, Ε΄ (501-600), Ἀποστολικὴ Διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Ἀθήνα 2003.

171. Ἡ τελεσιουργία τοῦ μυστηρίου τῆς θείας Εὐχαριστίας. Λειτουργικοὶ Τύποι τῆς Ἀνατολῆς.
*ΠΙΣΙΜΔ, «Ἡ θεία Εὐχαριστία», Δράμα 2003, σσ. 29-66, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Γ΄, Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 125-157.*

172. Τοῦ ἁγίου Συμεὼν ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης, Περὶ τῆς Ἱερᾶς Λειτουργίας. Εἰσαγωγὴ - Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια.
*ΠΙΣΙΜΔ, «Ἡ θεία Εὐχαριστία», Δράμα 2003, σσ. 375-401.*

173. Τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς ἀναθεωρήσεως τῶν λειτουργικῶν βιβλίων τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας.

*ΠΠΛΣ (Β΄), «Λατρεύσωμεν εὐαρέστως τῷ Θεῷ». Τὸ αἴτημα τῆς λειτουργικῆς ἀνανεώσεως στὴν Ὀρθόδοξη Ἐκκλησία, Ἀθήνα 2003, σσ. 123-139, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Γ΄, Ἀθήνα 2007, σσ. 9-25.*

174. Τελετουργικὴ προσέγγιση τῆς θείας Λειτουργίας.

*ΠΠΛΣ (Γ΄), «Τὸ μυστήριο τῆς θείας Εὐχαριστίας», Ἀθήνα 2004, σσ. 153-178, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Γ΄, Ἀθήνα 2007, σσ. 47-70.*

175. Τελετουργικὴ προσέγγιση τῶν ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν τοῦ Ἀρραβῶνος καὶ τοῦ Γάμου.

*ΠΠΛΣ (Δ΄), «Ὁ Γάμος στὴν Ὀρθόδοξη Ἐκκλησία», Ἀθῆναι 2004, σσ. 179-196, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Γ΄, Ἀθήνα 2007, σσ. 87-107.*

176. Τὸ σύστημα τῶν ἁγιογραφικῶν ἀναγνωσμάτων στὴν Ὀρθόδοξη Λατρεία. Πλεονεκτήματα, μειονεκτήματα, δυνατότητες βελτιώσεως.

*ΠΠΛΣ (Ε΄), «Ἱερουργεῖν τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον. Ἡ Ἁγία Γραφὴ στὴν Ὀρθόδοξη Λατρεία», Ἀθήνα 2004, σσ. 67-78, καὶ ΤΘ, τόμ. Γ΄, Ἀθήνα 2007, σσ. 159-171.*

177. Ὁμιλητική,

*Θεσσαλονίκη $^{4}$2004.*

178. Λειτουργικὴ Α΄. Εἰσαγωγὴ στὴ θεία Λατρεία,

*Θεσσαλονίκη $^{4}$2004.*

179. Τὰ ἰουδαϊκὰ καὶ ἑλληνορωμαϊκὰ ἡμερολόγια καὶ οἱ χριστιανικὲς ἑορτές.

*ΠΠΛΣ (ΣΤ΄), «Χριστιανικὴ Λατρεία καὶ εἰδωλολατρία», Ἀθήνα 2005, σσ. 273-284.*

180. Νεκρώσιμα Τελετουργικά.

*Η΄ ΕΣΧΘ, «Ταφὲς καὶ κοιμητήρια», Θεσσαλονίκη 2005, σσ. 25-36, καὶ ΤΘ, Ἀθήνα 2002, σσ. 147-164.*

181. Οἱ «Ἁγιόκουπες» τοῦ Σκευοφυλακίου τῆς Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Βλατάδων.

*Θ΄ ΕΣΧΘ, «Ἡ ἱερὰ Βασιλική, Πατριαρχικὴ καὶ Σταυροπηγιακὴ Μονὴ Βλατάδων», Θεσσαλονίκη 2005, σσ. 161-175.*

182. Ὁ Καθηγητὴς Παναγιώτης Ν. Τρεμπέλας ὡς λειτουργιολόγος.

*«Συμβολή. Ἐπιθεώρησις τοῦ Ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ Τυπικοῦ εἰς τὴν τάξιν τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Λατρείας», 14 (2006) 3-7.*

183. Τὸ λειτουργικὸ τυπικὸ τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης μέχρι τὸν Η΄ αἰῶνα.

*ΙΑ΄ ΕΣΧΘ, «Πόλις συναντήσεως Ἀνατολῆς καὶ Δύσεως», Θεσσαλονίκη 2006, σσ. 299-307.*

184. Ἱστορικὴ ἐξέλιξις καὶ τάξις τῶν χειροτονιῶν.

*ΠΠΛΣ (Ζ΄), «Τὸ Μυστήριον τῆς Ἱερωσύνης», Ἀθήνα 2006, σσ. 175-194.*

185. Τελετουργικὰ Θέματα, τόμ. Β΄: [Α) Ἡ γυναίκα στὴ λειτουργικὴ ζωὴ καὶ ἐνοριακὴ διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Β) Ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος στὴ θεία Λατρεία. Γ) Ἡ λειτουργικὴ ἀνανέωση στὴν Ὀρθόδοξη Ἐκκλησία. Δυνατότητες καὶ ἐμπόδια. Δ) Σύγχρονα λειτουργικὰ προβλήματα. Ε) Θεία Λατρεία καὶ τέχνη. Σχέσεις Λατρείας καὶ τεχνῶν στὸν Ὀρθόδοξο ναό. ΣΤ) Ὀρθόδοξη γυναίκα καὶ Λατρεία. Α) Τὸ «Πάσχα» τῶν Χριστουγέννων. Η) Ἁγιορειτικὰ λειτουργικὰ Τυπικά. Θ) Ἡ ἀναβίωση τοῦ ἀσματικοῦ τυπικοῦ. Ι) Ἡ μεγάλη Τεσσαρακοστὴ καὶ ὁ σύγχρονος ἄνθρωπος. ΙΑ) Ὁ ἱερέας ὡς μυσταγωγός. ΙΒ) Παράδοση καὶ ἐξέλιξη τῶν ἱερῶν ἀμφίων].

*Σειρὰ «Λογικὴ Λατρεία» 12, ἐκδ. Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας, Ἀθήνα 2006.*

186. Τελετουργικὰ Θέματα, τόμ. Γ΄: [Α) Τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς ἀναθεωρήσεως τῶν λειτουργικῶν βιβλίων τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας. Β) Τὰ ἱερὰ Μνημόσυνα. Γ) Τελετουργικὴ προσέγγιση τῆς θείας Λειτουργίας. Δ) Σχόλια στὴν Ἀκολουθία τῆς Μετανοίας. Ε) Τελετουργικὴ προσέγγιση τῶν ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν τοῦ Ἀρραβῶνος καὶ τοῦ Γάμου. Στ) Οἱ Μακαρισμοὶ στὴν Ὀρθόδοξη Λατρεία. Ζ) Ἡ τελεσιουργία τοῦ Μυστηρίου τῆς θείας Εὐχαριστίας. Λειτουργικοὶ τύποι τῆς Ἀνατολῆς. Η) Τὸ σύστημα τῶν ἁγιογραφικῶν ἀναγνωσμάτων στὴν Ὀρθόδοξη Λατρεία. Πλεονεκτήματα, μειονεκτήματα, δυνατότητες βελτιώσεως. Θ) Οἱ Ἀκολουθίες τῶν Ὡρῶν καὶ τὰ Τυπικά. Ι) Τὰ ἰουδαϊκὰ καὶ ἑλληνορωμαϊκὰ ἡμερολόγια καὶ οἱ χριστιανικὲς ἑορτές. ΙΑ) Ἡ Ἀκολουθία τῶν Ἐγκαινίων τοῦ Ναοῦ. ΙΒ) Ἱστορικὴ ἐξέλιξις καὶ τάξις τῶν χειροτονιῶν].

*Σειρὰ «Λογικὴ Λατρεία» 16, ἐκδ. Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας, Ἀθήνα 2007.*

187. Ὁ Ναὸς τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ Σοφίας. Ἑορτολογικὰ προβλήματα.

*Ι, ΕΣΧΘ, «Ἱστορία, Λατρεία καὶ Τέχνη τοῦ Ἱεροῦ Ναοῦ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ Σοφίας», Θεσσαλονίκη 2007, σσ. 57-80.*

188. Γένεσις τῶν χριστιανικῶν ἑορτῶν.

*ΠΠΛΣ (Η΄), «Τὸ Χριστιανικὸν Ἑορτολόγιον», Ἀθήνα 2007, σσ. 47-64.*

189. Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, τεῦχ. Α΄, Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ Νυχθημέρου. [1) Τριθέκτη. 2) Παννυχίς. 3) Μοναχικὸς Ἑσπερινός. 4) Μοναχικὸς Ὄρθρος. 5) Μεγάλαι Ὧραι τῆς παραμονῆς τῆς Ἁγίας Πεντηκοστῆς. 6) Εἰκοσιτετράωρον Ὡρολόγιον.],

*Θεσσαλονίκη 1994.*

190. Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, τεῦχ. Β΄, Θέματα Εὐχολογίου. [1) Χειροτονία Πρεσβυτέρου. 2) Τάξις γινομένη ἐπὶ θεμελίῳ Ἐκκλησίας. 3) Ἀκολουθία εἰς φόβον σεισμοῦ. 5) Ἀκολουθία τοῦ Εὐχελαίου. 6) «Μεγάλη Ἑβδομὰς» τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου. 7) Ἀκολουθία τοῦ Μνημοσύνου.],

*Θεσσαλονίκη ἄ.ἔ.*

191. Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, τεῦχ. Γ΄, Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι. [1) Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ Ἀποστόλου Μάρκου. 2) Θεία Λειτουργία Ἰακώβου τοῦ Ἀδελφοθέου. 3) Λειτουργία Προηγιασμένων Δώρων. 4) Βυζαντιναὶ Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου καὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου. 5) Θεία Λειτουργία τῶν «Ἀποστολικῶν Διαταγῶν». 6) Θεία Λειτουργία τῆς Ἀρμενικῆς Ἐκκλησίας. 7) Λειτουργία Προηγιασμένων Δώρων Ἰακώβου τοῦ Ἀδελφοθέου.],

*Θεσσαλονίκη 2007.*

192. Ἴχνη διαβάσεως τοῦ Ἀποστόλου Παύλου ἀπὸ τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ ἰδιαιτέρως ἀπὸ τὴν Θεσσαλονίκη,

*ΙΕ΄ ΕΣΧΘ, «Χριστιανικὴ Θεσσαλονίκη· ἀπὸ τὴ β΄ στὴ γ΄ χιλιετία», Θεσσαλονίκη 2008, σσ. 203-215.*

193. Μιὰ ἀλληλογραφία γιὰ λειτουργικὰ θέματα,

*«Ἀνάπλασις» 437 (2008) 150-151.*

194. Τυπικὸν ἢ Τυπικαὶ σημειώσεις ὑπὸ Μεθοδίου Ἱερομονάχου Σιμωνοπετρίτου τοῦ Ἡλιοπολίτου, ἐν Ἁγίῳ Ὄρει Ἄθω 1890, μεταγραφὴ κειμένου καὶ ἐπιμέλεια Ἰωάννου Μ. Φουντούλη,

*ὑπὸ ἔκδοσιν.*

195. Τοῦ ἁγίου Συμεὼν ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης. Περὶ τῆς ἀκολουθίας τῶν Ὡρῶν καὶ τῶν Τυπικῶν. Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια,

*ὑπὸ ἔκδοσιν.*

196. Τοῦ ἁγίου Συμεὼν ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης. Περὶ Ναοῦ. Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια,

*ὑπὸ ἔκδοσιν.*

197. Ἁγίου Μάρκου τοῦ Εὐγενικοῦ, Μητροπολίτου Ἐφέσου. Ἐξήγησις τῆς Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Ἀκολουθίας. Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια,

*ὑπὸ ἔκδοσιν.*

198. Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα, Θ΄ (41-45): [μα΄) Νικόλαος Καβάσιλας ὁ μυσταγωγός, μβ΄) Ἑρμηνεία ἑπτὰ δυσκόλων σημείων τοῦ κειμένου τῆς θείας λειτουργίας ἀπὸ τὸν Νικόλαο Καβάσιλα, μγ΄) Ἡ «Διάταξις τῆς θείας Λειτουργίας» τοῦ Φιλοθέου τοῦ Κοκκίνου, μδ΄) Οἱ ἅγιοι Κύριλλος καὶ Μεθόδιος στὸ ἑορτολόγιο καὶ στὴν ὑμνογραφία τῆς Ἑλλαδικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, με΄) Οἱ νεομάρτυρες Νικόλαος ὁ Θεσσαλονικεύς, ὁ ἐν Καρυαῖς Θερμῆς τῆς Λέσβου μαρτυρήσας, καὶ Δαβὶδ ὁ Κυδωνιεύς, ὁ ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ μαρτυρήσας.],

*ὑπὸ ἔκδοσιν.*

199. Λειτουργικὰ Θέματα, Ι΄ (46-50): [μς΄) Τὸ ἀρχέτυπο τῆς Ὀρθοδοξίας τελειούμενο στὴ θεία Λατρεία, μζ΄) Ἡ Λειτουργικὴ στὸ πρόγραμμα τῶν σχολείων, μη΄) Ἡ μαθητικὴ θεία λειτουργία, μθ΄) Τὸ ἑνοποιητικὸ ἔργο τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Λατρείας, ν΄) Οἱ λαϊκοὶ στὴν πράξη τῆς Λατρείας.],

*ὑπὸ ἔκδοσιν.*

## ΑΓΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΑ – ΛΕΣΒΙΑΚΑ

1. Οἱ ἅγιοι Γεώργιοι ἀρχιεπίσκοποι Μυτιλήνης.
   *ΛΕ Α΄, Ἀθῆναι 1959, σσ. 52.*
2. Γαβριὴλ μητροπολίτου Μηθύμνης, «Περιγραφὴ τῆς Λέσβου»,
   *Ἀθῆναι 1960, σσ. 48.*
3. Ὁ ἅγιος Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ ἐν Λέσβῳ.
   *ΛΕ Β΄, Ἀθῆναι 1960, σσ. 80.*
4. Οἱ ὅσιοι αὐτάδελφοι Δαβίδ, Συμεὼν καὶ Γεώργιος οἱ ὁμολογηταί.
   *ΛΕ Γ΄, Ἀθῆναι 1961, σσ. 70+ιε΄.*
5. Γεωργίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Μυτιλήνης, Λόγος τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ μεγάλῃ Παρασκευῇ (κῶδ. Καρακάλλου).
   *Θ 32 (1961) 645-650.*
6. Οἱ Τοῦρκοι κατακτηταὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀκολουθίαις τῶν Λεσβίων ἁγίων.
   *ΛΔΕΛΜ 4 (1962) 76-90. Ἀνάτυπον, Ἀθῆναι 1962.*
7. Τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς γνησιότητος τῆς ἐπιστολῆς Λεονάρδου τοῦ Χίου πρὸς τὸν πάπαν Πίον τὸν ΙΙ.
   *ΟΠ 27 (1962) 34-38. Ἀνάτυπον, Μυτιλήνη 1962.*
8. Ἡ ἁγία Θωμαΐς ἡ Λεσβία.
   *ΛΕ Δ΄, Μυτιλήνη 1964, σσ. 22.*
9. Ἡ τιμὴ τῶν λειψάνων καὶ τῶν τάφων τῶν Λεσβίων ἁγίων
   *ΛΔΕΛΜ 5 (1965) 14-64.*
10. Ὁ ὅσιος Γεώργιος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Μυτιλήνης ὁ ὁμολογητής.
    *ΟΠ 33 (1968) 85-87.*
11. Νικηφόρου τοῦ Χίου, 1. «Ἀκολουθία παρακλητική... ἐπειδὰν συμβῇ ταῖς βασάνοις ἐγκαρτερεῖν τινὰ νέον μάρτυρα». 2. «Ἀκολουθία ἐπικήδειος εἴτε ἐπιτάφιος... κοινὴ εἰς πάντα νέον μάρτυρα».
    *«Μνήμη 1821», Θεσσαλονίκη 1971, σσ. 63-91.*
12. Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ ἐν Λέσβῳ.
    *ΟΠ 36 (1971) 277-281.*
13. Τὸ προσκύνημα τοῦ σεβασμιωτάτου Μητροπολίτου Μυτιλήνης κ. Ἰακώβου εἰς τὰς Κυδωνίας (Ἀϊβαλί).

*ΟΠ 49 (1984) 187-192, καὶ «Μικρασιατικὴ Ἠχώ», ἔτος 42ο -ἀριθ. φύλ. 341, Ἰούλιος – Αὔγουστος 1999, σσ. 8, 9 καὶ 15.*

14. Οἱ ἅγιοι νεομάρτυρες Νικόλαος ὁ Θεσσαλονικεύς, ὁ ἐν Καρυαῖς τῆς Θερμῆς τῆς Λέσβου μαρτυρήσας, καὶ Δαβὶδ ὁ Κυδωνιεύς, ὁ ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ μαρτυρήσας.

*ΠΘΣΙΜΘ 1988, σσ. 483-494, καὶ ΛΘ, Θ΄, σσ. 117-127. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1988.*

15. Λεσβιακὸ ἑορτολόγιο.

*ΟΠ 56 (1991) 316-323· 57 (1992) 15-20, καὶ «Παλλεσβιακὴ Ἕνωση Θεσσαλονίκης», Δεκέμβριος 1991, σ. 7· Φεβρουάριος 1992, σ. 7, καὶ ΛΑΜ Α΄, Μυτιλήνη 1997, σσ. 27-48.*

16. Οἱ τρεῖς ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι τῆς Μυτιλήνης.

*ΟΠ 56 (1991) 175-182· 255-259, καὶ ΛΑΜ Α΄, Μυτιλήνη 1997, σσ. 75-91.*

17. Ὁ ὅσιος Συμεὼν Θεσσαλονίκης ὁ νεοφανής.

*ΓΠ 75 (1992) 1215-1254.*

18. Ὁ ὅσιος Συμεὼν Στυλίτης «ὁ ἐν τῇ Μάνδρᾳ» (†459).

*ΟΠ 57 (1992) 223-227, καὶ ΛΑΜ Α΄, Μυτιλήνη 1997, σσ. 65-73.*

19. Ἄγνωστοι ἅγιοι τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης. Οἱ ἅγιοι καλλίνικοι μάρτυρες Παῦλος, Βήλων, Θέων, Ἥρων καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς (2 Ἰουλίου).

*ΓΠ 76 (1993) 15-27.*

20. Ἡ «Περιγραφὴ τῆς Λέσβου» τοῦ Μητροπολίτου Μηθύμνης Γαβριὴλ Σουμαρούπα (1618-24/2/1621),

*Μυτιλήνη 1993, σσ. 45.*

21. Ἁγιολογικὲς πηγὲς τῆς Λέσβου.

*«Γραπτὲς Πηγὲς στὴ Λέσβο. Ὁ πλοῦτος τῶν τοπικῶν συλλογῶν», Μυτιλήνη 1993, σσ. 15-30.*

22. «Συμεὼν τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου Στυλίτου αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη» (Συνοδικὸν τῆς Ὀρθοδοξίας).

*Κλ 25 (1993) 123-135. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1995.*

23. Ὁ Ταξιάρχης.

*ΟΠ (1993) 233-237, καὶ ΛΑΜ Α΄, Μυτιλήνη 1997, σσ. 49-56.*

24. Ὁ νεομάρτυς Γεώργιος Παϊζάνος. Τριακόσια χρόνια ἀπὸ τὸ μαρτύριό του (1693-1993).
*ΟΠ 59 (1994) 18-20, καὶ ΛΑΜ Α΄, Μυτιλήνη 1997, σσ. 141-146.*

25. Ὁ νέος ὁσιομάρτυς Λουκᾶς. Δύο νέες «ἐνθυμήσεις» γιὰ τὸ μαρτύριό του († 23 Μαρτίου 1802).
*ΟΠ 59 (1994) 70-73, καὶ ΛΑΜ Α΄, Μυτιλήνη 1997, σσ. 147-153.*

26. Ἅγιοι τῶν ἐνοριῶν καὶ τῶν προσκυνημάτων τῶν Κυδωνιῶν.
*ΟΠ 59 (1994) 209-210.*

27. Ὁ ἅγιος Ἀνδρέας Κρήτης, ἡ Ἔρεσὸς καὶ ὁ μέγας κανών.
*ΟΠ 60 (1995) 7-10, καὶ ΛΑΜ Α΄, Μυτιλήνη 1997, σσ. 57-64.*

28. Τὸ «Διονυσιάτικο Μετόχι» στὴ Μυτιλήνη.
*ΟΠ 60 (1995) 79-81, καὶ ΛΑΜ Α΄, Μυτιλήνη 1997, σσ. 155-160.*

29. Τὸ «Διονυσιάτικο Μετόχι» στὶς Κυδωνίες (Ἀϊβαλί).
*ΟΠ (1995) 102-103, καὶ ΛΑΜ Α΄, Μυτιλήνη 1997, σσ. 161-165.*

30. Τὸ πρόβλημα τοῦ διπλοῦ τάφου τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου ἐπισκόπου Ἄσσου.
*ΟΠ 60 (1995) 138-140, καὶ ΛΑΜ Α,΄ Μυτιλήνη 1997, σσ. 103-108.*

31. Οἱ νεομάρτυρες τῆς Λέσβου.
*ΟΠ 60 (1995) 169-172· 210-213· 233-235· 259-262, καὶ ΛΑΜ Α΄, Μυτιλήνη 1997, σσ. 119-139.*

32. Ἡ ἀκολουθία «τοῦ ἁγίου Συμεὼν τοῦ Στυλίτου καὶ τοῦ Γεωργίου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ».
*Κλ 28 (1996) 289-300. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1997.*

33. Ὁ Φώτης Κόντογλου καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι τῆς Λέσβου.
*ΟΠ 61 (1996) 7-9, καὶ ΛΑΜ Α΄, Μυτιλήνη 1997, σσ. 167-172.*

34. Ἡ μητέρα τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου ἐπισκόπου Ἄσσου.
*ΟΠ 61 (1996) 40-42. 74-76, ΛΑΜ Β΄, Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 93-101.*

35. Μιὰ ἐνδιαφέρουσα εἰκόνα τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου ἐπισκόπου Ἄσσου.
*ΟΠ 61 (1996) 102-106, καὶ ΛΑΜ Α', σσ. 109-117.*

36. Τὸ πρόβλημα τοῦ βιογράφου τῆς ὁσίας Θεοκτίστης τῆς Λεσβίας.
*ΟΠ 61 (1996) 266-268, καὶ ΛΑΜ Β', Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 103-108.*

37. Λεσβιακὰ Ἁγιολογικὰ Μελετήματα Α': [1) Ἁγιολογικὲς πηγὲς τῆς Λέσβου. 2) Λεσβιακὸ Ἑορτολόγιο. 3) Ὁ Ταξιάρχης. 4) Ὁ ἅγιος Ἀνδρέας Κρήτης, ἡ Ἔρεσὸς καὶ ὁ μέγας κανών. 5) Ὁ ὅσιος Συμεὼν ὁ Στυλίτης. 6) Οἱ τρεῖς ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι τῆς Μυτιλήνης. 7) Ἡ μητέρα τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου ἐπισκόπου Ἄσσου. 8) Τὸ πρόβλημα τοῦ διπλοῦ τάφου τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου ἐπισκόπου Ἄσσου. 9) Μιὰ ἐνδιαφέρουσα εἰκόνα τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου ἐπισκόπου Ἄσσου. 10) Οἱ νεομάρτυρες τῆς Λέσβου. 11) Ὁ νεομάρτυς Γεώργιος Παϊζάνος. Τριακόσια χρόνια ἀπὸ τὸ μαρτύριό του (1693-1993). 12) Ὁ νέος ὁσιομάρτυς Λουκᾶς. Δύο νέες «ἐνθυμήσεις» γιὰ τὸ μαρτύριό του († 23 Μαρτίου 1802). 13) Τό «Διονυσιάτικο Μετόχι» στὴ Μυτιλήνη. 14) Τό «Διονυσιάτικο Μετόχι» στὶς Κυδωνίες (Ἀϊβαλί). 15) Ὁ Φώτης Κόντογλου καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι τῆς Λέσβου],
*Μυτιλήνη 1997, σσ. 173.*

38. Ἀπὸ τὴν ἀλήθεια τοῦ Συναξαρίου στὸ προσχεδιασμένο μυθιστόρημα.
*«Τιμητικὸν ἀφιέρωμα εἰς τὸν Σεβασμιώτατον Μητροπολίτην Ὕδρας, Σπετσῶν καὶ Αἰγίνης Ἱερόθεον, ἐπὶ τῇ συμπληρώσει τριακονταετοῦς ποιμαντορίας (1967-1997)», Ὕδρα 1997, σσ. 375-381, καὶ ΛΑΜ Β', Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 127-138.*

39. Μιὰ λεπτομέρεια τοῦ βίου τῆς ὁσίας Θεοκτίστης - Ἡ μεταφορὰ τῆς θείας κοινωνίας ἀπὸ λαϊκό.
*ΟΠ 62 (1997) 12-16, καὶ ΛΑΜ Β', Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 109-117.*

40. Ὁ τάφος καὶ ἡ εἰκόνα τῆς ὁσίας Θεοκτίστης τῆς Λεσβίας στὴν Ἑκατονταπυλιανὴ τῆς Πάρου.
*ΟΠ 62 (1997) 47-50, καὶ ΛΑΜ Β', Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 119-126.*

41. Ἡ ὁσία Καλή.
*ΟΠ (1997) 108-110· 134-137, καὶ ΛΑΜ Β', Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 139-150.*

42. Ἡ νῆσος Λέσβος κατὰ τὴν «Γεωγραφίαν» τοῦ Μητροπολίτου Ἀθηνῶν Μελετίου († 1714).
*ΟΠ 62 (1997) 175-177.*

43. Ὁ τίμιος Σταυρὸς τοῦ Κυρίου.
*ΟΠ 62 (1997) 193-196, καὶ ΛΑΜ Β΄, Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 13-20.*

44. Εὕρεση καὶ ἐπαναπατρισμὸς ἑνὸς χειρογράφου τοῦ ἱεροῦ ναοῦ Ἁγίου Συμεὼν Μυτιλήνης.
*ΟΠ 62 (1997) 264-267, καὶ ΛΑΜ Β΄, Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 186-196.*

45. Οἱ ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ ἅγιοι μάρτυρες Παῦλος, Βήλων (Πίλλων), Θέων (Θεωνᾶς) καὶ Ἥρων. – Ἡ ἀκολουθία τους.
*Κλ 29 (1997) 63-73. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1998.*

46. Ἡ ὁσία Θεοκτίστη ἡ Λεσβία.
*«Ἡ Ἑκατονταπυλιανὴ καὶ ἡ Χριστιανικὴ Πάρος» - Πρακτικὰ Ἐπιστημονικοῦ Συνεδρίου. Πάρος 1998, σσ. 231-243, καὶ ΛΑΜ Β΄, Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 79-102. Ἀνάτυπον, Πάρος 1998.*

47. Τὸ περιεχόμενο καὶ τὰ σημειώματα τοῦ χειρογράφου τοῦ ἱεροῦ ναοῦ Ἁγίου Συμεὼν Μυτιλήνης.
*ΟΠ 63 (1998) 9-12, καὶ ΛΑΜ Β΄, Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 197-204.*

48. Οἱ ἀκολουθίες τοῦ χειρογράφου τοῦ ἱεροῦ ναοῦ Ἁγίου Συμεὼν Μυτιλήνης.
*ΟΠ 63 (1998) 108-111, καὶ ΛΑΜ Β΄, Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 205-218.*

49. Ὁ νεομάρτυς Δούκας ὁ ράπτης ὁ Μυτιληναῖος († 24 Ἀπριλίου 1564) – Μιὰ ἄγνωστη εἰκόνα του.
*ΟΠ 63 (1998) 175-177, καὶ ΛΑΜ Β΄, Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 171-178.*

50. Ἀκολουθία καὶ ἔμμετρο συναξάριο τῆς ἁγίας Θωμαΐδος τῆς Λεσβίας.
*«Kanon XV» Kirchenrecht und Ökumene Festgabe Panteleimon Rodopoulos Kovar, München – Eichenau 1999, σσ. 41-58.*

51. Ὁ ἅγιος νεομάρτυς Θεόδωρος ὁ Βυζάντιος. Διακόσια χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν ἀνακομιδὴ τοῦ ἱεροῦ λειψάνου του (1798-1898).

*ΟΠ 63 (1998) 77-87, καὶ «Ὁ νεομάρτυς Θεόδωρος ὁ Βυζάντιος πολιοῦχος Μυτιλήνης», ΠΕΣ, Μυτιλήνη 2000, σσ. 33-42.*

52. «Τὸ πάντιμον λείψανον τοῦ Θεοδώρου...».
*«Ὁ νεομάρτυς Θεόδωρος ὁ Βυζάντιος πολιοῦχος Μυτιλήνης», ΠΕΣ, Μυτιλήνη 2000, σσ. 239-255.*

53. Ἀκολουθία εἰς τὴν ἀνακομιδὴν τοῦ λειψάνου τοῦ ἁγίου νεομάρτυρος Θεοδώρου τοῦ Βυζαντίου, εἰσαγωγὴ – ἔκδοση.
*«Ὁ νεομάρτυς Θεόδωρος ὁ Βυζάντιος πολιοῦχος Μυτιλήνης», ΠΕΣ, Μυτιλήνη 2000, σσ. 443-472.*

54. Ἕνα δημῶδες ποίημα ἀφιερωμένο στὸν νεομάρτυρα Θεόδωρο τὸν Βυζάντιο.
*ΟΠ 65 (2000) 184-189, καὶ ΛΑΜ Β΄, Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 179-188.*

55. Ἡ Παναγία Φανερωμένη τῶν Κυδωνιῶν (Ἀϊβαλί).
*«Ἀναφορὰ εἰς μνήμην Μητροπολίτου Σάρδεων Μαξίμου 1914-1986» - Ἱερὰ Μητρόπολις Ἑλβετίας 9 - Ἵδρυμα διὰ τὴν Χριστιανικὴν Ἑνότητα Atef Danial, Γενεύη 1989, σσ. 174-232, καὶ ἔκδ. Ἱ. Μητροπόλεως Μυτιλήνης, 17, Μυτιλήνη ²2000.*

56. Ἡ τιμὴ τῶν λειψάνων καὶ τῶν τάφων τῶν Λεσβίων ἁγίων.
*Μυτιλήνη 1965, καὶ Μυτιλήνη ²2001.*

57. Ἡ τιμὴ τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου.
*ΙΒ΄ ΕΣΧΘ, 2001, σσ. 165-176.*

58. Οἱ ἐπιδρομὲς τῶν Σαρακηνῶν στὴν Λέσβο καὶ οἱ ἅγιοί της.
*ΛΑΜ Β΄, Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 47-77*

59. Ἀποστολικὲς μνῆμες στὴν Λέσβο.
*ΛΑΜ Β΄, Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 21-46.*

60. Ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος Ἄσσου - Ἡ μονή, ὁ τάφος καὶ ἡ τιμή του.
*ΛΑΜ Β΄, Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 151-170.*

61. Λεσβιακὰ Ἁγιολογικὰ Μελετήματα Β΄: [16) Ὁ τίμιος Σταυρὸς τοῦ Κυρίου. 17) Ἀποστολικὲς μνῆμες στὴν Λέσβο. 18) Οἱ ἐπιδρομὲς τῶν Σαρακηνῶν στὴν Λέσβο καὶ οἱ ἅγιοί της. 19) Ἡ ὁσία Θεοκτίστη ἡ Λεσβία. 20) Τὸ πρόβλημα τοῦ βιογράφου τῆς ὁσίας Θεοκτίστης τῆς Λεσβίας. 21) Μιὰ λεπτομέρεια τοῦ βίου τῆς ὁσίας Θεοκτίστης - Ἡ μεταφορὰ θείας κοινωνίας ἀπὸ λαϊκό. 22) Ὁ τάφος καὶ ἡ

εἰκόνα τῆς ὁσίας Θεοκτίστης τῆς Λεσβίας στὴν Ἑκατονταπυλιανὴ τῆς Πάρου. 23) Ἀπὸ τὴν ἀλήθεια τοῦ Συναξαρίου στὸ προσχεδιασμένο μυθιστόρημα. 24) Ἡ ὁσία Καλή. 25) Ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος ἐπίσκοπος Ἄσσου - Ἡ μονή, ὁ τάφος καὶ ἡ τιμή του. 26) Ὁ νεομάρτυς Δούκας ὁ ῥάπτης ὁ Μυτιληναῖος († 24 Ἀπριλίου 1564) – Μιὰ ἄγνωστη εἰκόνα του. 27) Ἕνα δημῶδες ποίημα ἀφιερωμένο στὸν νεομάρτυρα Θεόδωρο τὸν Βυζάντιο. 28) Εὕρεση καὶ «ἐπαναπατρισμὸς» ἑνὸς χειρογράφου τοῦ ἱεροῦ ναοῦ Ἁγίου Συμεὼν Μυτιλήνης. 29) Τὸ περιεχόμενο καὶ τὰ σημειώματα τοῦ χειρογράφου τοῦ ἱεροῦ ναοῦ Ἁγίου Συμεὼν Μυτιλήνης. 30) Οἱ ἀκολουθίες τοῦ χειρογράφου τοῦ ἱεροῦ ναοῦ Ἁγίου Συμεὼν Μυτιλήνης],

*Μυτιλήνη 2002, σσ. 226.*

62. Ὁ πρωτοσύγκελλος Ἀρσένιος Μενεξὲς καὶ ὁ ἐθνομάρτυς Μητροπολίτης Κυδωνιῶν Γρηγόριος Ὡρολογᾶς στὸ Μοναχολόγιο τῆς Ἱ. Μονῆς Τιμίου Προδρόμου Σερρῶν.

*ΟΠ 67 (2002) 187-190, 218-221.*

63. Ἡ ἁγία Θωμαΐς ἡ Λεσβία: Τὸ μαρτύριο τοῦ συζυγικοῦ βίου. «Ἡ ὁσία Θωμαΐς». Ἐτήσια ἔκδοση τῆς Ὀρθόδοξης Κοινότητας. «Ἡ ὁσία Θωμαΐς» ἡ ἐκ Λέσβου, ἔτος 2003, ἀριθμ. 2, σσ. 5-8.

64. Ὁ Μυτιληναῖος Δωρόθεος καὶ ἡ Σύνοδος Φερράρας-Φλωρεντίας.

*«Αἰολικὰ Χρονικὰ» 6 (2004) 107-113.*

65. Μητροπολίτου Μυτιλήνης Δωροθέου († 1444) «Διδασκαλία».

*«Λεσβιακὰ» 20 (2004) 238-244.*

66. Ἐγκώμιο τῆς Μυτιλήνης στὸν βίο τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου ἐπισκόπου Ἄσσου.

*ΟΠ 69 (2004) 253-256.*

67. Ἀνθολογία ἀπὸ τὸ ποιητικὸ ἔργο τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀνδρέου Κρήτης τοῦ Ὑμνογράφου.

*«Ὁ ἅγιος Ἀνδρέας Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κρήτης, ὁ Ἱεροσολυμίτης, πολιοῦχος Ἐρεσοῦ Λέσβου», ΠΕΣ, Μυτιλήνη 2005, σσ. 37-49.*

68. Ὁ ἅγιος Ἀνδρέας Κρήτης καὶ ἡ Ἐρεσός.

*«Ὁ ἅγιος Ἀνδρέας Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κρήτης ὁ Ἱεροσολυμίτης, πολιοῦχος Ἐρεσοῦ Λέσβου», ΠΕΣ, Μυτιλήνη 2005, σσ. 67-77.*

69. Ὁ ἅγιος Ἀνδρέας Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κρήτης, στὸ ἑορτολόγιο καὶ στὴν ὑμνογραφία.

*«Ὁ ἅγιος Ἀνδρέας Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κρήτης, ὁ Ἱεροσολυμίτης, πολιοῦχος Ἐρεσοῦ Λέσβου», ΠΕΣ, Μυτιλήνη 2005, σσ. 345-355.*

70. Συναξάρια ἁγίου Ἀνδρέου Κρήτης, Εἰσαγωγή – Κείμενο – Σχόλια.

*«Ὁ ἅγιος Ἀνδρέας Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κρήτης, ὁ Ἱεροσολυμίτης, πολιοῦχος Ἐρεσοῦ Λέσβου», ΠΕΣ, Μυτιλήνη 2005, σσ. 455-469.*

71. Ὕμνοι πρὸς τιμὴν ἁγίου Ἀνδρέου Κρήτης (ἐκδεδομένοι), Εἰσαγωγή – Ἔκδοση κειμένων – Σχόλια – Εὑρετήρια.

*«Ὁ ἅγιος Ἀνδρέας Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κρήτης, ὁ Ἱεροσολυμίτης, πολιοῦχος Ἐρεσοῦ Λέσβου», ΠΕΣ, Μυτιλήνη 2005, σσ. 479-541.*

72. Ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος Ἐπίσκοπος Ἄσσου, πολιοῦχος Γέρας. Ἑβδομήντα χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν εὕρεση τῆς Μονῆς, τοῦ τάφου καὶ τῶν λειψάνων του.

*«Ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος Ἐπίσκοπος Ἄσσου ὁ θαυματουργός», ΠΕΣ, Μυτιλήνη 2006, σσ. 57-66.*

73. Ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος Ἄσσου στὴν ὑμνογραφία.

*«Ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος Ἐπίσκοπος Ἄσσου ὁ θαυματουργός», ΠΕΣ, Μυτιλήνη 2006, σσ. 233-274.*

74. Τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου Ἐπισκόπου Ἄσσου – Βίοι κατ' ἐπιτομὴν («Συναξάρια»).

*«Ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος Ἐπίσκοπος Ἄσσου ὁ θαυματουργός», ΠΕΣ, Μυτιλήνη 2006, σσ. 439-483.*

75. Ὕμνοι πρὸς τιμὴν τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου Ἐπισκόπου Ἄσσου.

*«Ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος Ἐπίσκοπος Ἄσσου ὁ θαυματουργός», ΠΕΣ, Μυτιλήνη 2006, σσ. 484-587.*

## ΠΡΟΛΟΓΟΙ – ΕΙΣΑΓΩΓΕΣ – ΠΡΟΣΦΩΝΗΣΕΙΣ – ΕΠΙΜΕΛΕΙΕΣ – ΧΡΟΝΙΚΑ – ΓΝΩΜΑΤΕΥΣΕΙΣ

1. Ἑρμηνεία Εὐαγγελίων τῶν Κυριακῶν, τόμ. Α΄, Θεσσαλονίκη 1972.
   *«Πρόλογος καὶ εἰσαγωγή», σσ. 7-16.*
2. Ἑρμηνεία Εὐαγγελίων τῶν Κυριακῶν, τόμ. Β΄, Θεσσαλονίκη 1973.
   *«Πρόλογος καὶ εἰσαγωγή», σσ. 7-16.*
3. Ἑσπεριναὶ ἑρμηνευτικαὶ ὁμιλίαι, τόμ. Α΄. «Ἐλπὶς ζῶσα» (Α΄ Πέτρου), Θεσσαλονίκη 1973.
   *«Πρόλογος», σσ. 5-8.*
4. Ἑσπεριναὶ ἑρμηνευτικαὶ ὁμιλίαι, τόμ. Β΄. «Τὸ σωτήριον πάθος» (Λουκ. κεφ. 22-23), Θεσσαλονίκη 1974.
   *«Πρόλογος», σσ. 7-9.*
5. Προσφώνησις εἰς τὸ Διορθόδοξον Θεολογικὸν Συμπόσιον Θεσσαλονίκης (12-16 Σεπτεμβρίου 1972).
   *ΕΕΘΣΠΘ 19 (1974), 45-49 καὶ γαλλικὴ μετάφραση, σσ. 50-54.*
6. Τίτου Συλλικαρδάκη, Μητροπολίτου Ρεθύμνης καὶ Αὐλοποτάμου, Χριστοῦ Σμύρνα, Ρέθυμνο 1980.
   *«Πρόλογος», σσ. 9-12.*
7. Μανουὴλ Γεδεών, Ἁγιοποιήσεις, Θεσσαλονίκη 1984.
   *«Πρόλογος», σσ. 7-9.*
8. Δ. Γρηγοριάδη, Ἐπιτομὴ τῆς ἱερᾶς Ἱστορίας, Ἅγιον Ὄρος $^{2}$1985.
   *«Ἀντὶ Προλόγου», σσ. 3-4.*
9. Ἱεροδιακονικόν, Καρυαὶ-Ἅγιον Ὄρος 1989.
   *«Εἰσαγωγικά», σσ. ια΄-ιστ΄.*
10. Ἱερατικόν, τόμ. Α΄. Ἡ θεία Λειτουργία Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου, ἔκδ. Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας - Ἅγιον Ὄρος 1992.
    *«Εἰσαγωγικὸν σημείωμα», σσ. ι΄-ιθ΄.*
11. Ἱερατικόν, τόμ. Β΄. Ἡ θεία Λειτουργία Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου, ἔκδ. Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας - Ἅγιον Ὄρος 1992.
    *«Εἰσαγωγικὸν σημείωμα», σσ. ζ΄-ια΄.*
12. Νικολάου Καβάσιλα, Ἑρμηνεία τῆς θείας Λειτουργίας. (Μετάφραση Ἀντωνίου Γαλίτη), Θεσσαλονίκη $^{2}$1991.
    *«Πρόλογος», σσ. 13-14.*

13. Ἱερατικόν, τόμ. Γ'. Ἡ θεία Λειτουργία τῶν Προηγιασμένων, ἔκδ. Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας - Ἅγιον Ὄρος 1992.

    *«Εἰσαγωγικὸν σημείωμα», σσ. ζ'-ι'.*

14. Γεωργίου Ρήγα, Τυπικόν, «Λειτουργικὰ Βλατάδων 1», Θεσσαλονίκη 1994.

    *«Προλεγόμενα», σσ. 7-10.*

15. Βασιλείου Σταυρίδου, Οἰκουμενικὸν Πατριαρχεῖον. Ἡ Ἱερὰ Ἀρχιεπισκοπὴ Αὐστραλίας, «Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων 60», Θεσσαλονίκη 1994.

    *«Προλογικὸν σημείωμα», σ. 7.*

16. J.-P. Migne, Patrologia Graeca, τ. 155 (Νέα Ἑλληνικὴ Ἔκδοσις), Ἀθῆναι 1994.

    *Εἰσαγωγή. Ὁ ἅγιος Συμεὼν Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θεσσαλονίκης (†1429), σσ. θ'-ιθ'.*

17. Θεία Λειτουργία Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου. Ἀντιγραφὴ καὶ διακόσμησις... μοναχοῦ Γαβριὴλ Π. Μαμουγιώργη Ἐπανωσηφήτου, ἔκδ. Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Ἁγίου Γεωργίου Ἐπανωσήφη 1995.

    *«Πρόλογος», σσ. IX-XI.*

18. Συλλειτουργικόν, ἤτοι ἡ τάξις Ἀναγνώστου καὶ Ψάλτου, ἔκδ. Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας - Ἅγιον Ὄρος 1996.

    *«Προλογικὸν σημείωμα», σσ. η'-ιστ'.*

19. Ὑμνολόγιον τὸ χαρμόσυνον, ἤγουν χαιρετιστήριοι εἰς ἁγίους καὶ ἑορτὰς τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, ἔκδ. Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σταυροβουνίου–Κύπρος (1996).

    *«Εἰσαγωγή», σσ. 7-15.*

20. Βασιλείου Σταυρίδου, Δημοσιεύματα. Μία τεσσαρακονταετία (1951-1990), Θεσσαλονίκη 1996.

    *«Προλογικὸν σημείωμα», σ. 7.*

21. Γεωργίου Μαρνέλλου, Ὁ ἱερεὺς ὡς μάρτυρας τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ στὴν Ἐκκλησία καὶ τὸν κόσμο, Ἅγιος Νικόλαος Κρήτης 1996 ($^{2}$1999).

    *«Πρόλογος», σσ. 9-10.*

22. Προεστωτικόν, περιέχον ἅπαντα τὰ ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἀκολουθίαις τῷ Προεστῶτι ἀνήκοντα, ἔκδ. Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας, Ἅγιον Ὄρος 1997.

    *«Εἰσαγωγικὸν σημείωμα», σσ. θ'-ιδ'.*

23. Μοναχοῦ Θεοκλήτου Διονυσιάτου, Γεράσιμος μοναχὸς Μικραγιαννανίτης, Ὑμνογράφος τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας, Θεσσαλονίκη 1997.
*«Πρόλογος», σσ. 11-14.*

24. Χαραλάμπου Κ. Καμηλάκη, Πρωτοπρεσβυτέρου, Μελετήματα Εὐθύνης, τόμ. Α΄, Ρέθυμνο 1997.
*«Πρόλογος», σσ. 12-13.*

25. Χρονικὸν τῆς ἐπισκέψεως τῆς Α.Θ.Π. τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριάρχου εἰς τὸ Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν.
*Κλ 29 (1997) 75-86. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1998.*

26. Γεωργίου Ἰ. Χατζηθεοδώρου, Βιβλιογραφία τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Μουσικῆς, Περίοδος Α΄ (1820-1899), «Ψαλτικὰ Βλατάδων 1», Θεσσαλονίκη 1998.
*«Προλογικὸν σημείωμα», σσ. 9-10.*

27. Σύναξις Πάντων τῶν Σιναϊτῶν Ἁγίων, ἔκδ. Ἱερᾶς Ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς Σινᾶ, Ἀθῆναι 1998. (Γνωματεύσεις, σσ. 206-208· 209-211· 237-239).

28. Ποία εἶναι ἡ ἀναγνωστέα εὐαγγελικὴ περικοπὴ κατὰ τὴν πρώτην Κυριακὴν Δεκεμβρίου τοῦ ἔτους 2000. (Γνωμοδότησις).
*Ε 76 (1999) 644-646.*

29. Ἀκολουθία ἐπευλογήσεως παντὸς ἔργου καὶ δραστηριότητος δημοσίου χαρακτῆρος. (Γνωμοδότησις).
*Ε 76 (1999) 735-737.*

30. Γωργίου Ρήγα, Οἰκονόμου, Ζητήματα Τυπικοῦ, «Λειτουργικὰ Βλατάδων 2», Θεσσαλονίκη $^{2}$1999.
*«Προλογικὸν σημείωμα», σσ. 9-10.*

31. Παντελεήμονος Ροδοπούλου, Ὁ καθαγιασμὸς τῶν δώρων τῆς θείας Εὐχαριστίας, «Λειτουργικὰ Βλατάδων 3», Θεσσαλονίκη 2000.
*«Προλογικὸν σημείωμα», σ. 5.*

32. Εὐχολόγιον Α΄. Ἁγιασματάριον, ἔκδ. Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας – Ἅγιον Ὄρος 2001.
*«Εἰσαγωγικὸν σημείωμα», σσ. ια΄-ιζ΄.*

33. Ἀμβροσίου (Σταυρινοῦ) σχολάζοντος Μητροπολίτου Καισαρείας, Αἱ ἀρχαιόταται καὶ αἱ σύγχρονοι λειτουργίαι τῶν κυριωτέρων τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησιῶν (ἐπιμελείᾳ Ἀρχιμ. Νικοδήμου Σκρέττα), «Λειτουργικὰ Βλατάδων 4», Θεσσαλονίκη 2001.
*«Προλογικὸν σημείωμα», σσ. 9-11.*

34. «Ἅγιον Ὄρος. Φύση – Λατρεία – Τέχνη». Πρακτικὰ Συνεδρίων, τόμ. Α΄, Θεσσαλονίκη 2001.
*«Πρόλογος», σ. 171.*

35. Γερασίμου Ἁγιορείτου μοναχοῦ, Ὁ ἀγὼν τῆς σωτηρίας, Ἀθῆναι 2001.
*«Πρόλογος», σσ. 7-9.*

36. Μακαρίου Βαρλᾶ, Ἀρχιμ., Θεία Λατρεία «ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ», Ἀθήνα 2001.
*«Πρόλογος», σσ. 13-19.*

37. «Κληρονομία», Δημοσίευμα Πατριαρχικοῦ Ἱδρύματος Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν. Εὑρετήριον τόμων Α΄ (1969) – Λ΄ (1998), συναχθὲν ὑπὸ Ἀδαμαντίου Στ. Ἀνεστίδη, Θεσσαλονίκη, τόμ. 33, τεύχη Α΄-Β΄, Ἰούλιος-Δεκέμβριος 2001.
*«Πρόλογος», σσ. 13-14.*

38. Γεωργίου Π. Σωτηρίου, Ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, Θεσσαλονίκη 2002.
*«Προλογικὸν σημείωμα», σσ. 9-12.*

39. Κωνσταντίνου Τσιλιγιάννη, Ἁγίου Μαξίμου τοῦ Γραικοῦ Παρακλητικὸς Κανὼν εἰς τὸν τίμιον Πρόδρομον, Ἅγιον Ὄρος 2001.
*«Πρόλογος», σσ. 5-7.*

40. Εὐχολόγιον Γ΄. Ἐξοδιαστικόν, ἔκδ. Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας - Ἅγιον Ὄρος 2002.
*«Εἰσαγωγικὸν σημείωμα», σσ. ε΄-ιδ΄.*

41. Ἀποστόλου Μπουρνέλη, «Πατέρων Λόγος 6», «Θυσίαν Αἰνέσεως», Ἡράκλειο 2003.
*«Πρόλογος», σσ. 7-9.*

42. Ψαλτήριον μετὰ τροπαρίων καὶ εὐχῶν, ἔκδ. Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Παντοκράτορος, Ἅγιον Ὄρος 2004.
*«Εἰσαγωγικὸν σημείωμα», σσ. ιγ΄-ιθ΄.*

43. Γερβασίου Χ. Παρασκευοπούλου, Ἀρχιμ., Ἑρμηνευτικὴ Ἐπιστασία ἐπὶ τῆς θείας Λειτουργίας, Πάτραι $^{2}$2005.
*«Πρόλογος», σσ. 13-15.*

44. Μαρτυρίες Προσκυνητῶν. Γέροντας Παΐσιος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης (1924-1991), ἐπιμέλεια. Νικόλαος Ἀ. Ζουρνατζόγλου, Θεσσαλονίκη $^{2}$2005.
*«Πῶς γνώρισα τὸν π. Παΐσιο», σσ. 77-79.*

45. Ἰωάννου Χατζῆ, Ζαχαρίου Καραντινοῦ Ἀκολουθία καὶ Συναξάριο τῶν νεομαρτύρων Χρίστου καὶ Πανάγου τῶν ἐκ Γαστούνης (1716), Ἀθήνα 2005.

*«Πρόλογος», σσ. 7-8.*

46. Ἰωάννου Ν. Ἠλιούδη, Ρυθμὸς καὶ ἁρμονία. Ἡ μουσικότητα τοῦ λόγου. Πρόταση γιὰ ἑλκυστικὴ διδασκαλία τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ λόγου στὴν ἐκπαίδευση, Θεσσαλονίκη 2005.

*«Πρόλογος ἐπιστολιμαῖος», σ. 9.*

47. Χρυσοστόμου Ζαφειροπούλου, Ἱερομονάχου, Ἡ ἱερωσύνη κατὰ τὸν Ἰσίδωρον Πηλουσιώτην, ἐκδ. «Ὀρθόδοξος Κυψέλη», Θεσσαλονίκη 2005.

*«Πρόλογος», σσ. 13-15.*

48. Ἁσματικὴ Ἀκολουθία τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Μακαρίου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κορίνθου τοῦ Νοταρᾶ. Ἐπιμελείᾳ: Ἰωάννου Μ. Φουντούλη. «Ὁ ἅγιος Μακάριος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κορίνθου ὁ Νοταρᾶς», Ἁσματικὴ Ἀκολουθία, Βίος καὶ Πολιτεία, Θαύματα, Χαιρετισμοί, Παρακλητικὸς Κανών», Σιδηρόκαστρο 2005, ἔκδ. Ἱ. Μονῆς Ἁγίων Κηρύκου καὶ Ἰουλίττης ([2]2011).

*«Εἰσαγωγικὸν σημείωμα», σσ. 9-14.*

49. Θυρανοίξια, ἤτοι Ἀκολουθία ἐπὶ τῇ εἰσόδῳ εἰς νεόδμητον ἱερὸν Ναὸν καὶ τῇ ἐνάρξει λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ. Ἐκδίδεται ἐπὶ τοῖς θυρανοιξίοις τοῦ ἐν Πυλαίᾳ Θεσσαλονίκης ἱεροῦ Μετοχιακοῦ Ναοῦ τῆς Μονῆς Βλατάδων (Μπασίς), τοῦ τιμωμένου ἐπ' ὀνόματι τοῦ ἁγίου ἐνδόξου Ἀποστόλου Ἀνδρέου τοῦ Πρωτοκλήτου, Εὐλογίᾳ τοῦ Σεβασμιωτάτου Μητροπολίτου Τυρολόης καὶ Σερεντίου κ. Παντελεήμονος ἡγουμένου τῆς Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Βλατάδων, ἐπιμελείᾳ Ἰωάννου Μ. Φουντούλη,

*Θεσσαλονίκη 2006.*

50. Παραδοσιακὸς Οἰκισμὸς Ἀμπελικοῦ, Τοπίο παρθένας ὀμορφιᾶς, ἔκδ. Ἱεροῦ Ναοῦ Ἁγίου Νικολάου Ἀμπελικοῦ, ἄ.ἔ.

*«Ἀναφορὰ στὸ Λεύκωμα», σσ. 3-5.*

51. Ἀλκιβιάδη Κ. Καζαμία, Ἡ θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰακώβου τοῦ Ἀδελφοθέου καὶ τὰ νέα σιναϊτικὰ χειρόγραφα, Θεσσαλονίκη 2006.

*«Πρόλογος», σσ. 13-14.*

## ΒΙΒΛΙΟΚΡΙΣΙΕΣ

1. Néophyte Edelby, Liturgicon, Missel byzantin à l' usage des fidéles, Beyrouth 1958, σχ. 16ον, σσ. 973.
   *Θ 31 (1960) 655-658.*

2. G. Garitte, Le calendrier palestino-géorgien du Sinaiticus 34 (X^e siècle), Subsidia Hagiographica, n° 30, Bruxelles 1958, σχ. 8ον, σσ. 488.
   *Θ 31 (1960) 469.*

3. J. Doresse – E. Lanne, Un témoin archaïque de la liturgie copte de s. Basile, Bibliothèque du Meséon, vol. 47, Louvain 1960, σχ. 8ον, σσ. 44.
   *Θ 31 (1960) 470.*

4. B. Capelle, Les Liturgies "basiliennes" et saint Basile, Louvain 1960, σχ. 8ον, σσ. 29 (45-47).
   *Θ 31 (1960) 471.*

5. A. Raes avec le concours de plusieurs collaborateurs (E. Lanne, B. Mercier, J. M. Sauget), Le Mariage dans les Églises d' Orient, Collection Irénikon, éditions de Chevetogne 1959, σχ. 8ον, σ. 200.
   *Θ 31 (1960) 168-170.*

6. Ἀριστοτέλειον Πανεπιστήμιον Θεσσαλονίκης. Ἀθωνικὴ Πολιτεία, ἐπὶ τῇ χιλιετηρίδι τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους, ἐπιμελείᾳ Π. Κ. Χρήστου, Θεσσαλονίκη 1963, σχ. 8ον, σσ. 712.
   *Ελ 20 (1967) 192-194.*

7. Τριῴδιον Κατανυκτικόν, περιέχον ἅπασαν τὴν ἀνήκουσαν αὐτῷ ἀκολουθίαν τῆς ἁγίας καὶ Μεγάλης Τεσσαρακοστῆς..., ἔκδοσις νέα ἐπιμελημένη, ἐκδ. «Φῶς», Ἀθῆναι 1967, σχ. 8ον, σσ. 536.
   *ΓΠ 51 (1968) 80-85.*

8. Βιβλιοκρισίαι. Ἀνατύπωση τῶν ἀνωτέρω,
   *Θεσσαλονίκη 1968.*

9. Henrica Follieri, Initia Hymnorum Ecclesiae Graecae, τόμ. I (A - Z) σσ. XXVIII + 590, τόμ. II (H - Ξ), σσ. XXII + 570, τόμ. III (O - Σ) σσ. XXII + 618, τόμ. IV (T - Ὑ), σσ. XXII + 459, τόμ. V pars prior (Φ - Ω, Hymnographi, Tabulae), σσ. XXII + 331, τόμ. V pars altera (Index hagiographico - liturgicus), σσ. XXII + 370. Studi e Testi 211-215 bis. Città del Vaticano, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana 1960-1966.
   *Κλ 4 (1972) τεῦχ. Α', σσ. 167-173.*

10. Juan Mateos, La célébration de la parole dans la Liturgie byzantine. Étude historique. Orientalia Christiana Analecta 191, Roma 1971, σσ. 184.

*Κλ 6 (1974) τεῦχ. Β΄, σσ. 407-408. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1974.*

11. Μάκη Ἀξιώτη, Στὰ χνάρια τὰ παληά. Ὁδοιπορικὸ γύρω ἀπὸ τὸν κόλπο τῆς Γέρας, ἔκδ. Παγγεραγωτικοῦ Πολιτιστικοῦ Συλλόγου Ἀθήνας, Ἀθῆναι 1987, σχ. 24 Χ 17, σσ. 232.

*Κλ 22 (1990) 353-354. Βιβλιογραφικὸν Δελτίον, ἀνάτυπον ἐκ τῆς «Κληρονομίας», τόμ. 22, τεύχη Α΄-Β΄, 1990, Θεσσαλονίκη 1993.*

12. Ἰωάννου Κ. Μουτζούρη, Ὁ μοναχισμὸς τῆς Λέσβου. Συμβολὴ στὴν ἱστορία καὶ μοναστηριολογία, ἔκδ. Ἑταιρείας Λεσβιακῶν Μελετῶν, Μυτιλήνη 1989, σχ. 24 Χ 17, σσ. 214.

*Κλ 23 (1991) 344-346.*

13. Γεωργίου Τσέτση, Ἡ ἔνταξις τῶν ἁγίων στὸ Ἑορτολόγιο, ἐκδόσεις «Τέρτιος», Κατερίνη 1991 , σχ. 14 Χ 20, σσ. 233.

*Κλ 23 (1991) 364-366.*

14. Μάκη Ἀξιώτη, Περπατώντας τὴ Λέσβο. Τοπογραφία - Ἱστορία - Ἀρχαιολογία. Τόμοι Α΄ καὶ Β΄, Μυτιλήνη 1992, σχ. 24Χ17, σσ. 904.

*Κλ 24 (1992) 370-371.*

15. Ἡρακλῆ Δ. Βακιρτζῆ, Θησαυροὶ τῆς Λέσβου. Εἰκόνες Ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ Βυζαντινοῦ Μουσείου Μυτιλήνης, ἔκδ. Ἐκκλ. Βυζαντινοῦ Μουσείου Μυτιλήνης, Μυτιλήνη 1989, σχ. 28 Χ 20, σσ. 160, ἔγχρωμοι πίνακες 69.

*Κλ 25 (1993) 346-349.*

16. The Coptic Liturgy of St. Basil, ἔκδ. Orthodox Centre for Religious Studies St. John the Beloved Publishing House, Cairo, Egypt (1993), σχ. 0,15Χ0,20, σσ. 314 διπλὲς (628).

*Κλ 25 (1993) 379-381.*

17. Sources Chrétiennes (= SC), Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris 1942 καὶ ἑξῆς, σχ. 0,20Χ0,13.

*Κλ 25 (1993) 382-389.*

18. SC No 25bis: Ambroise de Milan, Des Sacrements, Des Mystères, Explication du Symbole. Introduction, texte, traduction, notes et index par † Dom Bernard Botte, Paris 1994, σσ. 225.

*Κλ 25 (1993) 382-383.*

19. SC No 225bis: Dhuoda, Manuel pour mon fils. Introduction, texte critique, notes par Pierre Riché, traduction par Bernard de Vregille et Claude Mondésert, Paris 1991, σσ. 400.

    *Κλ 25 (1993) 383-384.*

20. SC No 358: Grégoire de Naziance, Discours 38 - 41. Introduction, texte critique et notes par Claudio Moreschini, traduction par Paul Gallay, Paris 1999, σσ. 289.

    *Κλ 25 (1993) 384.*

21. SC No 359: Aphraate le Sage Persan, Les Exprosés, tome II, Exposés XI - XXIII. Traduction du syriaque, notes et index par Marie - Joseph Pierre, Paris 1989, σσ. 1042.

    *Κλ 25 (1993) 38-385.*

22. SC No 369: Grégoire le Grand, Homélies sur Ézéchiel, tome II (Livre II). Texte latin, introduction, traduction, notes et index par Charles Morel, Paris 1990, σσ. 561.

    *Κλ 25 (1993) 385.*

23. SC No 361: Nicolas Cabasilas, La vie en Christ, livres V -VIII. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, annotation et index par Marie Hélène Congourdeau, Paris 1990, σσ 247.

    *Κλ 25 (1993) 385-386.*

24. SC No 362: Jean Chrysóstome, Discours sur Babylas. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Margaret A. Schatkin avec la collaboration de Cécil Blanc et Bernard Grillet. Καὶ Homélie sur Babylas. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Bernard Grillet et Jean - Noël Guinot, Paris 1990, σσ. 330.

    *Κλ 25 (1993) 386.*

25. SC No 363: Grégoire de Nysse, Lettres. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes et index par Pierre Maraval, Paris 1990, σσ. 346.

    *Κλ 25 (1993) 386-387.*

26. SC No 364: Geoffroy d'Auxerre, Entretien de Simon-Pierre avec Jesus. Introduction, texte, traduction et annotation par Henri Rochais, Paris 1990, σσ. 328.

    *Κλ 25 (1993) 387.*

27. SC No 365: Tertullien, Contre Marcion, tome I, (livre I). Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par René Braun, Paris

1990, σσ. 315. SC No 368: Tertullien, Contre Marcion, tome II, (livre II). Texte critique, traduction et notes par René Braun, Paris 1991, σσ. 235. SC No 399: Tertullien, Contre Marcion, tome III, (livre III). Introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes et index des livres I - III par René Braun. Paris 1994, σσ. 363.

*Κλ 25 (1993) 387-388.*

28. SC No 366: Jean Chrysostome, Trois Catéchèses baptismales. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Auguste Piédagnel avec la collaboration de Louis Doutrelaux, Paris 1990, σσ. 288.

*Κλ 25 (1993) 388.*

29. SC No 367: Bernard de Clairvaux, Éloge de la nouvelle chevalerie, Vie de saint Malachie, Épitaphe, Hymne, Lettres. Introduction, traduction, notes et index par Pierre Yves Emery. Paris 1990, σσ. 486.

*Κλ 25 (1993) 389.*

30. Δοσιθέου Ἀρχιμανδρίτου, Διάταξις τῆς ἀγρυπνίας. Ἔκδοσις Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Παναγίας Τατάρνης 1993 (6' ἔκδοσις), σχ. 24X17, σσ. 111.

*Κλ 26 (1994) 370-372.*

31. Sources Chrétiennes (= SC), Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris 1942 καὶ ἑξῆς, σχ. 0,20X0,13.

*Κλ 26 (1994) 375-382.*

32. SC No 369: Eusébe de Césarée, La préparation evangelique. Livres VIII - IX - X. Introduction, traduction et notes des livres VIII et X par Guy Schroeder et Edouard des Places, du livre IX par Edouard des Places, texte grec révisé des livres VIII - IX - X par Edouard des Places, Paris 1991, σσ. 510.

*Κλ 26 (1994) 375.*

33. SC No 370 καὶ SC No 371: Grégoire le Grand, Registe des Lettres. Tome I* (Livres I et II). Tome I** (Livres I et II). Introduction, texte, traduction, notes et appendices par Pierre Minard, Paris 1991, σσ. 541.

*Κλ 26 (1994) 375.*

34. SC No 372: Cyrille d' Alexandrie, Lettres festales I - VI. Introduction génerales par Pierre Evieux, introduction critique, texte grec par W. H. Burns, traduction et annotations par Louis Arra-

gon, Marie - Odile Boulnois, Pierre Evieux, Marguerit Forrat, Bernard Meunier, Paris 1991, σσ. 423.

*Κλ 26 (1994) 376.*

35. SC No 373: Actes de la Conférence de Carthage en 411. Tome IV. Additamentum criticum, notices sur les sièges et les toponymes, notes complémentaires et index par Serge Lancel, Paris 1991, σσ. 1635.

*Κλ 26 (1994) 376-377.*

36. SC No 374: Eugippe, Vie de saint Séverin. Introduction, texte latin, traduction, notes et index par Philippe Régerat, Paris 1991, σσ. 326.

*Κλ 26 (1994) 377.*

37. SC No 375 και SC No 376: Origène, Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques. Tome I (Livres I - II). Tome II (Livres III - IV). Texte de la version latine de Rufin, introduction, traduction, notes et index par Luc Brésard et Henri Crouzel avec la collaboration de Marcel Borret, Paris 1991, 1992, σσ. 820.

*Κλ 26 (1994) 377-378.*

38. SC No 377: Lactance, Institutions Divines Livre IV. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes et index par Pierre Monat, Paris 1992, σσ. 279.

*Κλ 26 (1994) 378.*

39. SC No 378: Galand de Reigny, Parabolaire. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes et index par Collette Friedlander, Jean Leclerg, Gaetano Raciti, Paris 1992, σσ. 471.

*Κλ 26 (1994) 378-379.*

40. SC No 379: Athenagore, Supplique au sujet des Chrétiens et sur la résurrection des morts. Introduction, texte et traduction par Bernard Pouderon, Paris 1992, σσ. 360.

*Κλ 26 (1994) 379.*

41. SC No 380: Colloque de Lyon - Cîteau - Dijon, Bernard de Clairvaux. Histoire, mentalités, spiritualité, Paris 1992, σσ. 751.

*Κλ 26 (1994) 379.*

42. SC No 381 και SC No 382: Grégoire le Grand, Régle Pastorale. Tome I and II. Introduciton, notes et index par Bruno Judic. Tex-

te critique par Floribert Rommel. Traduction par Charles Morel, Paris 1992, σσ. 573.

*Κλ 26 (1994) 379-380.*

43. SC No 383: Jean Damascène, Ecrits sur l' Islam. Présentation, commentaires et traduction par Raymond Le Cor, Paris 1992, σσ. 272 [«Περὶ αἱρέσεων», Ἰσλάμ, Ἰσμαηλίται, διάλεξις Σαρακηνοῦ καὶ Χριστιανῶν].

*Κλ 26 (1994) 380.*

44. SC No 384: Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 42-43. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Jean Bernardi, Paris 1992, σσ. 325.

*Κλ 26 (1994) 380-381.*

45. SC No 385: Origène, Commentaire sur Saint Jean. Tome V (Livres XXVIII et XXXII). Texte grec, introduction, traduction et notes par Cécile Blanc, Paris 1992, σσ. 381.

46. SC No 386: Didyme l'Aveugle, Traité du Saint - Esprit. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes et index par Louis Doutreleau, Paris 1992, σσ. 449.

*Κλ 26 (1994) 381-382.*

47. Σωτ. Ν. Καδᾶ, Κῶδιξ ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Διονυσίου Ἁγίου Ὄρους ιη΄- ιθ΄ αἰ., ἔκδοση Ἱ. Μ. Διονυσίου, Ἅγιον Ὄρος 1994, σχῆμα 14Χ24, σσ. νη΄+ 214 + πίνακες (πανομοιότυπα) 16.

*Κλ 27 (1995) 366-368.*

48. Κύπρια Μηναῖα. Τόμος Α΄. Ἀκολουθίαι Σεπτεμβρίου. Ἔκδ. Ἱερὰ Ἀρχιεπισκοπὴ Κύπρου, ἐν Λευκωσίᾳ Κύπρου 1994, σχ. 32 Χ 24, σσ. 173.

*Κλ 27 (1995) 370-372.*

49. Σ. Τάξη, Οἰκονόμου, Συνοπτικὴ ἱστορία καὶ τοπογραφία τῆς Λέσβου, ἔκδοσις δευτέρα ἐπηυξημενη καὶ μετερρυθμισμένη, ἐν Καΐρῳ ἐκ τοῦ Τυπογραφείου Ἱ. Πολίτου, 1909, Φωτομηχανικὴ ἀνατύπωση, Πανεπιστήμιο Αἰγαίου, Τμῆμα Κοινωνικῆς Ἀνθρωπολογίας, Μυτιλήνη 1994, σχ. 17Χ24, σσ. η΄ + 144 + XXII.

*Κλ 27 (1995) 373-374.*

50. Ἀνατύπωση τῶν ἀνωτέρω ὑπ' ἀριθμ. 47, 48, 49, ἐν *Βιβλιογραφικὸν Δελτίον, ἀνάτυπον ἐκ τῆς «Κληρονομίας»*, τόμ. 27, τεύχη Α΄-Β΄, 1995,

*Θεσσαλονίκη 1996.*

51. Μιχαὴλ Κ. Στεφανίδη, Χυμεία καὶ Λέσβος. Τὸ Δημαρχιακὸν Χυμεῖον Μυτιλήνης καὶ Βιβλιογραφία Λέσβου (Ἀνατύπωσις ἐκ τῆς «Νέας Ἡμέρας»), ἐν Τεργέστῃ, Τύποις Αὐστριακοῦ Λόϋδ, 1903. Φωτομηχανικὴ ἀνατύπωση, Πανεπιστήμιον Αἰγαίου, Τμῆμα Κοινωνικῆς Ἀνθρωπολογίας, Μυτιλήνη 1994, σχ. 0,14X 0,21, σσ. κδ'+34+VIV.

*Κλ 28 (1996) 382-383.*

52. Π. Β. Πάσχου, «Ἅγιοι, οἱ φίλοι τοῦ Θεοῦ». Εἰσαγωγὴ στὴν Ἁγιολογία τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας [Ὑμναγιολογικὰ Κείμενα καὶ Μελέτες, 2], ἐκδ. Ἁρμός, Ἀθήνα 1995, σχ. 25 X 17 ἑκ. σσ. 310.

*Κλ 28 (1996) 385-387.*

53. Σωτ. Ν. Καδᾶ, Τὰ σημειώματα τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς Μονῆς Διονυσίου Ἁγίου Ὄρους, ἔκδ. Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Διονυσίου, Ἅγιον Ὄρος 1996, σχ. 25 X18 ἑκ., σσ. 417 + 30 πίνακες (πανομοιότυπα).

*Κλ 28 (1996) 391-392.*

54. Ἀνατύπωση τῶν ἀνωτέρω ὑπ' ἀριθμ. 51, 52, 53, ἐν *Βιβλιογραφικὸν Δελτίον, ἀνάτυπον ἐκ τῆς «Κληρονομίας»*, τόμ. 28, τεύχη Α'-Β', 1996,

*Θεσσαλονίκη 1997.*

55. Ἑλένης Παπαηλιοπούλου-Φωτοπούλου, Ταμεῖον ἀνεκδότων βυζαντινῶν ἀσματικῶν κανόνων, Σύλλογος πρὸς Διάδοσιν Ὠφελίμων Βιβλίων, Ἀθῆναι 1996, σχ. 25 X 18 ἑκ., σσ. 351.

*Κλ 29 (1997) 387-388.*

56. 1. Σ. Γ. Τ. (Σταύρου Γ. Τάξη), Συνοπτικὴ Ἱστορία τῆς Λέσβου καὶ τοπογραφία αὐτῆς, ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει 1874. Φωτομηχανικὴ ἀνατύπωση. Ἐπιμέλεια - παρουσίαση Β. Ἰ. Ἀναστασιάδη-Σ. Καράβα, Πανεπιστήμιο Αἰγαίου, Τμῆμα Κοινωνικῆς Ἀνθρωπολογίας, Μυτιλήνη 1996, σχ. 22X15, XXV+56+XXXL.
2. Ἀριστομένους Σταυρίδου, Ἐγχειρίδιον Πολιτικῆς, Φυσικῆς καὶ Ἐμπορικῆς Γεωγραφίας τοῦ Ὀθωμανικοῦ Κράτους ἐκ διαφόρων νεωτάτων εὐρωπαϊκῶν συγγραμμάτων ἐρανισθεῖσα, ἐν Κυδωνίαις, ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου Ἰωάννου Σαριβαξεβάνη 1876. Φωτομηχανικὴ ἀνατύπωση. Εἰσαγωγὴ Χ. Ἐξερτζόγλου. Ἐπιμέλεια – Εὑρετήριο Β. Ἰ. Ἀναστασιάδης - Σ. Καράβας. Πανεπιστήμιο Αἰγαίου, Τμῆμα Κοινωνικῆς Ἀνθρωπολογίας, Μυτιλήνη 1996, σχ. 25X18, κγ'+ 152 + 8 φωτογρ.+XXVI.

3. Σπ. Ἀναγνώστου, Λεσβιακά, ἤτοι Συλλογὴ Λαογραφικῶν περὶ Λέσβου πραγματειῶν, ἐν Ἀθήναις, ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου τῶν καταστημάτων «Ἀνέστη Κωνσταντινίδη» 1903. Φωτομηχανικὴ ἀνατύπωση, Πανεπιστήμιο Αἰγαίου, Τμῆμα Κοινωνικῆς Ἀνθρωπολογίας, Μυτιλήνη 1996, σχ. 25X18, σσ. XXV+ιη΄+272+XXI.

*Κλ 29 (1997) 389-391.*

57. Ἱερὰ Ἀρχιεπισκοπὴ Κύπρου, Κύπρια Μηναῖα (ἤτοι ἀκολουθίαι ψαλλόμεναι ἐν Κύπρῳ). Τόμος Β΄, Ἀκολουθίαι Ὀκτωβρίου, ἐν Λευκωσίᾳ 1995, σχ. 24 X 32, σσ. 350. Τόμος Γ΄, Ἀκολουθίαι Νοεμβρίου, ἐν Λευκωσίᾳ 1996, σσ. 223. Τόμος Δ΄, Ἀκολουθίαι Δεκεμβρίου, ἐν Λευκωσίᾳ 1997, σσ. 157.

*Κλ 29 (1997) 395-397.*

58. Ἀνατύπωση τῶν ἀνωτέρω ὑπ' ἀριθμ. 55, 56, 57, ἐν *Βιβλιογραφικὸν Δελτίον*, ἀνάτυπον ἐκ τῆς «Κληρονομίας», τόμ. 29, τεύχη Α΄-Β΄, 1997,

*Θεσσαλονίκη 1998.*

59. Παύλου Μενεβίσογλου, Μητροπολίτου Σουηδίας, Μελετήματα περὶ ἁγίου μύρου, Ἀθῆναι 1999, σχ. 24X17 ἐκ., σσ. 301.

*Κλ 31 (1999) 389-391.*

60. Σωτ. Ν. Καδᾶ, Τὰ σημειώματα τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς Μονῆς Βατοπαιδίου, Ἅγιον Ὄρος 2000, σχ. 17X24, σσ. μγ΄+396+20 πίνακες (πανομοιότυπα).

*Κλ 32 (2000) 502-504.*

61. Ἁγίου Χρυσοστόμου Μητροπολίτου Σμύρνης τοῦ ἱερομάρτυρος, Λόγοι εὐσεβείας, ἐκδ. «Μυγδονία», Θεσσαλονίκη 2000, σχ. 17X24, σσ. 149.

*Κλ 32 (2000) 499-504.*

62. Ἀνατύπωση τῶν ἀνωτέρω ὑπ' ἀριθμ. 60, 61, ἐν *Βιβλιογραφικὸν Δελτίον*, ἀνάτυπον ἐκ τῆς «Κληρονομίας», τόμ. 32, τεύχη Α΄-Β΄,

*Θεσσαλονίκη 2000.*

63. Παύλου Ντανᾶ, Ἀρχιμ., Προσευχητάριον ὑπὲρ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, Ἀθήνα 2005, σσ. 370.

*Κ 49 (Ἰαν.-Μάρτ. 2006) τεῦχ. 1, σ. 106.*

## ΝΕΚΡΟΛΟΓΙΕΣ

1. Γρηγόριος Παπαμιχαήλ. Ἵσταται τιμαί.
   *ΕΕΘΣΠΑ 1956, σσ. θ'-ιθ'.*
2. Dom Lambert Beuduin.
   *Θ 31 (1960) 472-473.*
3. Κυπριανὸς Kern, Ἀρχιμ.
   *Θ 31(1960) 473.*
4. Χρυσόστομος Ζαφειρόπουλος, Ἀρχιμ., ὁ σύγχρονος ἅγιος τοῦ Τσοτυλίου.
   *ΟΠ 47 (1981) 18-19.*
5. Καθηγητοῦ Ἰωάννου Ὀρ. Καλογήρου. Μνημόσυνα (καὶ βιβλιογραφία).
   *Κλ 29 (1997) 341-354. Ἀνάτυπο, Θεσσαλονίκη 1998.*
6. Ἀθανάσιος Γ. Τσερνόγλου (1927-2003).
   *«Λεσβιακὰ» 20 (2004) 364-365.*
7. Ὁ Μητροπολίτης Νέας Σμύρνης Χρυσόστομος Βοῦλτσος. Μία δεκαετία ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του (1986-1996).
   *«Ἀνησυχίες», Περιοδικὸ Χριστιανικοῦ Ὁμίλου Φοιτητῶν καὶ Ἐπιστημόνων, ἔτος ΚΔ', ἀρ. φύλ. 74, Ἀθήνα Ἰανουάριος-Δεκέμβριος 2006, σσ. 6-8.*

## ΑΡΘΡΑ ΣΕ ΕΓΚΥΚΛΟΠΑΙΔΕΙΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΕΡΙΟΔΙΚΑ

1. **Ἄρθρα στὴ «Θρησκευτικὴ καὶ Ἠθικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία».**

**α) Λειτουργικὰ βιβλία:**

Ἁγιασματάριον, Ἀνθολόγιον, Ἀρχιερατικόν, Goar Ἰάκωβος (Εὐχολόγιον), Μηναῖα.

**β) Λειτουργικὰ ἔπιπλα, σκεύη καὶ ἄμφια:**

Δαλματική, Δισκοκάλυμμα, Δίσκος, Θρόνος.

**γ) Θεία Λειτουργία:**

Ἀνάμα, Ἀντίδωρον, Ἄνω καθέδρα, Εἴσοδος, Ἕνωσις, Κοινωνικόν.

**δ) Μυστήρια καὶ λοιπαὶ ἀκολουθίαι:**

Ἀνοίξια, «Ἄξιος», Ἀπόλυσις, Ἀπομύρωμα, Ἀποκουκουλισμός, «Ἄρατε πύλας», Ἀρτοκλασία, Ἐγκαίνια ναοῦ, Ἔλαιον, Μνημόσυνα, Χρῖσμα (ἅγιον μύρον).

**ε) Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ νυχθημέρου - ὑμνολογία:**

Ἀναβαθμοί, Ἀναστάσιμος, Ἀνατολικά, Ἄννης ᾠδή, Ἀνοιξαντάρια, Ἀπολυτίκιον, Ἀπόστιχα, «Ἄσπιλε ἀμόλυντε...», Αὐτόμελα, Βηματίκια, Δοξαστικόν, Εἰκοσιτετράωρος ἀκολουθία, Ἐξαποστειλάριον, Θεοτοκία, Κεφαλοκλισίας Εὐχαί, Μηνολόγιον.

**στ) Λειτουργικὸν ἔτος:**

Ἄννης σύλληψις, Ἄννης κοίμησις, Ἄννης σύναξις, Ἀπόδοσις ἑορτῆς, Ἀπόδοσις Θεοτόκου, Ἀποστόλων δώδεκα σύναξις, Ἀρτζιβούριον, Ἀσωμάτων ἑορταί, Δωδεκαήμερον, Ἐγκαινίων ἀνάμνησις, Εὐαγγελισμοῦ ἑορτή, Θεοφάνεια, Κοιμήσεως Θεοτόκου ἑορτή.

**ζ) Ἁγιολογικὰ - Λεσβιακά:**

Ἀλέξανδρος Μηθύμνης, Ἀναστάσιος νεομάρτυς Πανέρας, Ἀνδρέου ἁγίου βασιλική, Ἀργάλων βασιλική, Ἀφεντέλλη βασιλική, Ἀχλαδερῆς βασιλική, Γαβριὴλ Μηθύμνης, Γεώργιος νεομάρτυς Ἴβηρ, Γεώργιος νεομάρτυς Παϊζάνος, Γεώργιοι ἀρχιεπίσκοποι Μυτιλήνης, Δούκας ὅσιος Μυτιληναῖος, Δούκας νεομάρτυς, Θωμαΐς ἡ Λεσβία.

η) Διάφορα:

Ἀκοιμήτων μονή, Ἀλέξανδρος Ἀκοίμητος, «Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς» περιοδικόν, Ἰωάννης Ἀκοίμητος.

2. **Τὰ λειτουργικὰ ἄρθρα στὴν Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια «Πάπυρος-Λαρούς».**

3. **Λέσβιοι Ἅγιοι στὴ Bibliotheca Sanctorum Orientalium, Roma.**

Ἀλέξανδρος Μηθύμνης, Ἀναστάσιος Πανέρας, Ἀνδρέας Κρήτης, Γεώργιος Ἴβηρ, Γεώργιος Ὁμολογητής, Γεώργιος Παΐζάνος, Γεώργιος Σημειοφόρος, Γεώργιος Χιοπολίτης, Γρηγόριος Ἄσσου, Δαβὶδ Κυδωνιεύς, Δαβὶδ ὅσιος, Δημήτριος νεομάρτυς, Δημήτριος Μπεγιάζης, Δούκας ράπτης, Εἰρήνη Θερμῆς, Εὐπρέπεια μάρτυς, Εὐφροσύνη ὁσιομάρτυς, Θεόδωρος Βυζάντιος, Θεόδωρος Χατζῆς, Θεοκτίστη Μηθυμναία, Θεοφάνης Σιγριανῆς, Θεωνᾶς Θεσσαλονίκης, Θωμαΐς Λεσβία, Ἰγνάτιος Μηθύμνης, Κωνσταντῖνος ἐξ Ἀγαρηνῶν, Λουκᾶς νεομάρτυς, Νικόλαος διάκονος Θερμῆς, Νικόλαος νεομάρτυς, Ὀλυμπία ὁσιομάρτυς Θερμῆς, Παρθένιος πατρ. Κων/λεως, Πέντε Νεάνιδες, Ραφαὴλ Θερμῆς, Συμεὼν στυλίτης ὁ Λέσβιος.

4. **Ἄρθρα στὰ περιοδικά:**

«Ἁλιεύς», Τρίπολις. «Ἄμπελος», Πύργος Ἠλείας. «Ἀπόστολος Τίτος», Ἡράκλειον Κρήτης. «Beseda», Novi Sad. «Ἐκκλησία», Ἀθῆναι. «Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια», Ἀθῆναι. «Ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ Ποιμένος», Καστορία. «Καθολική», Ἀθῆναι. «Κυδωνιατικὸς Ἀστέρας», Ἀθῆναι. «Ὁ Ἐφημέριος», Ἀθῆναι. «Ὁ Ποιμήν», Μυτιλήνη. «Ὀρθόδοξη Μαρτυρία», Λευκωσία. «Ὀρθόδοξος Ἐπιστασία», Κατερίνη. «Ὁ ὅσιος Νικάνωρ», Γρεβενά. «Ὁ φιλελεύθερος», Λευκωσία. «Παλλεσβιακὴ Ἕνωση Θεσσαλονίκης», Θεσσαλονίκη. «Παρουσία», Καβάλα. «Πηγὴ τῆς ἀληθείας», Γουμένισσα. «Πνευματικὴ Ἰατρική», Ἀθῆναι. «Φοιτητής», Θεσσαλονίκη. «Χριστιανικὸν φῶς», Χανιὰ Κρήτης.

IŌANNĒS M. PHOUNTOULĒS

# ANSWERS TO LITURGICAL QUESTIONS

## Volume 1

## 1–150

6th Edition

IN MEMORY OF

GEŌRGIOS KLEOMVROTOS, PRIEST

AND MARIA, PRESVYTERA

"Since it is necessary to the best of our ability also to respond to each one who asks in a brotherly manner, both on account of love and obedience, and the benefit that follows, 'A brother helped by a brother is [they say] like a strong city.'* And questioning in truth is an example of humility that honors, and, in turn, answering without boasting, a fruit of love and humility."

SYMEŌN OF THESSALONIKI
*Answers to certain questions asked of him by a hierarch.*

*Prov 18:19, modified.

## Prologue to the First Edition

This volume contains the answers to 150 liturgical (for the most part) questions of parish priests, which were published in the periodical, *Ὁ Ἐφημέριος*, during a period of almost three years, from the June 16, 1965, until the October 15, 1968, issue. The reprint was requested by many readers of these articles, who viewed them as helpful for their preparation and practice in their liturgical and pastoral work. To all these, along with those who defined the content of this publication through their questions and challenges, the writer expresses his warm thanks.

The priests' questions refer to a variety of subjects and the responses to them take place mainly in the order in which their letters were received. We did not wish to change this order in the reprint, for also among other reasons, because many of the later responses presupposed the earlier ones, to which they oftentimes refer. However, we have added at the end a table of contents according to the material covered as well as an analytical alphabetical index that will assist those desiring to find whatever interests them.[1] Repeatedly, we have made clear the purpose of these articles as well as the difficulties, before which the writer often found himself. Many of the questions referred to the most difficult and unexplored subjects. Others to simpler ones and of small importance. We treated both with the same seriousness, having always in view the wise words of Symeōn of Thessaloniki, "nothing is small in the Church of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ; nothing is without reason,[2] because the Church is the living Word itself. On account of which with reason all things are great" (*Dialogue against all heresies and con-*

1. In response to the author's wishes expressed in the introduction to volume five, a comprehensive index to all five volumes has replaced these tables and is contained in a sixth volume, "In any case, it would be desirable, where God gives and anticipates the number of answers, that it be completed with a general alphabetical index by subject for the entire series, in order for the searching and finding of what is sought to be easily accessible, a matter which now is quite difficult with the existence of five individual indexes by volume" (Prologue, volume five).

2. In this sentence, the use of the word "λόγος" is used as "without reason" (δίχα λόγου) and also to refer to Christ as "living Word" (ζῶντος Λόγου).

*cerning . . . the sacred rites*, chapter 365)[3] and "those things deemed small are full of this wisdom; and by how much considered small by some are of a much greater knowledge, because that which men deem the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness is stronger" (*Dialogue*, chapter 322).[4]

We avoided one-word answers, because we established as a goal of these articles not only that the inquirers should learn what they must do in each case, but also the reason for which it is necessary that they should do it. Strictly speaking, the correct knowledge of liturgical matters is a necessary presupposition for their correct celebration.

And the writer observed another principle: the presentation of knowledge should be made as simple and as clear as possible. For this reason, he also used the simple spoken language.[5]

It would not be humble at all if we did not repeat with the Fathers that "nothing of my own" exists in the things written here. At least, this was always the concern of the writer, namely, to present and to explain the correct liturgical tradition of the Church. If he was successful and if, through this, he offered the best as possible to his readers and in this manner helped them in their priestly service in wisdom and fear of God, he would consider that his small effort had attained its goal.

In Athens on July 26, 1967
on the commemoration of the Holy Hieromartyr Hermolaos

3. PG 155:680b.
4. PG 155:585d.
5. At the time, official documents were being published in katharevousa, a form of Greek regarded as purified of foreign elements and based on ancient Greek. For additional information, see Wendy Moleas, *The Development of the Greek Language*, 2nd ed. (London: Bristol Classical Press, 2004).

## Introduction

Respected father, the one who with God's support undertakes to answer your queries through this column of *Ὁ Ἐφημέριος*, your periodical, is not a man "who answers everything" or who comes to pretend to be wise and scholarly. However, he does promise you one thing: to make every effort by drawing upon the Holy Scriptures, the Fathers, the Church's Tradition and practice, and our theological literature, that he might give you correct responses to your questions.

By asking, you manifest the spirit of discipleship, which you have and that humbly motivates your thought in seeking the reason and the meaning of things, of divine things, and motivates your thirst for learning and understanding the mysteries of God and our Church, into which even "angels yearn to peer."[6] No one could not help but praise this your divine love.

But for another reason, you are even more praiseworthy. You are the priest of God the Most High, a celebrant of the sacred sanctuary, and a servant of the table, where the wisdom of God places the children of God and to which he invites them "with a loud proclamation."[7] You were believing and became an "initiator into the mysteries."[8] You were a sheep and became a shepherd. You were a member of the Church's congregation and "with fear and trembling"[9] stood afar from the sanctuary and, with the people of God, looked toward it afar from "the holy doors."[10] But there came a moment, when He, who chose and intended you "from your mother's womb"[11] for His sacred ministry, drew aside the veil for you and you entered into His

6. 1 Pet 1:12; holy unction, fifth prayer, "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ παιδεύων . . ."
7. Prov 9:3.
8. μυσταγωγός.
9. Phil 2:12.
10. τὰ ἅγια θύρια, the central doors leading into the sanctuary of an Orthodox temple, which are closed and opened during services.
11. Compare Isa 49:1; Judg 16:17.

innermost depths[12] and saw, "with your own eyes the presence of the holy anaphora."[13]

Ever since, a new world opened before you. A world of sacred symbols and mysteries, which as God's "good steward of grace"[14] you are called to administer; to celebrate; to be sanctified with them; and to sanctify the Lord's people, who from your hands now await the "bread of the angels,"[15] the heavenly sustenance. Through holy baptism, you will make them members of His Church and, with chrism, bestow them with the Holy Spirit's seven gifts. You will catechize them and initiate them into God's mysteries and guide them in His way, "in order to walk in [His] truth."[16] You will bestow on them the light of Christ, opening the eyes and ears of their hearts to the saving knowledge of Christ. Together with them, you will glorify God and guide their petitions and struggles like "acceptable incense"[17] to the Lord. From you, they will receive remission of their sins, and by your hands they will be anointed with holy unction "for healing of soul and body."[18] From you, their "lawful union"[19] will be blessed, and by your hands the crowns of their victory and joy will be placed on their heads.[20] And when the cry "Behold, the Bridegroom comes"[21] is heard for them, you will lovingly take them to "His meeting,"[22] providing them with the "provision" of eternal life and sending them forth as victors to their "resting place," in order to await the Resurrection.

---

12. τὰ ἐνδότερα.
13. This phrase and the images that precede concerning the inner depths and drawing-aside of the veil are taken from the service of holy unction, fifth prayer, "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ παιδεύων . . ."
14. 1 Pet 4:10.
15. In its patristic use, "ὁ ἄρτος τῶν ἀγγέλων" may signify "manna," but here it means the Eucharist; cf. Lampe, s.v. "ἄρτος, ὁ."
16. Vespers, first prayer, "Κύριε, οἰκτίρμον καὶ ἐλεῆμον . . ." (adapted).
17. Akathist, verse, "Χαῖρε δεκτὸν πρεσβείας θυμίαμα."
18. Jas 5:14–15.
19. Marriage, prayer, "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἄχραντος . . ."
20. A reference to the crowning that takes place in the service of holy marriage.
21. Matt 25:6.
22. Cf. Matt 25:1.

Your questions reveal that there is constant fear and agony before your work, and you wish to perform it with knowledge and precision "out of devotion" to your ministry. It will be to him who answers you an honor and great joy, if, with the things which he will write to you, they contribute in being helpful to both of these—your sacred desires—that you better learn and more precisely celebrate divine worship.

If, on the other hand, other questions may occur to you that do not relate directly to your liturgical work, you will be given the answer for them "the best as possible."

Let us now begin our dialogue. You will ask and the one who writes these words will respond, as best as we are able, in detail and with clarity. If, on the other hand, because of the answers new questions are created for you, or if you have perhaps a different opinion, we will be able to discuss them again with love, seeking together to discover the plain truth, which is the goal of every human being and especially the Christian, who believes in the Truth that frees humans from the darkness and makes them "a son of light and day,"[23] since with this they come to a more perfect knowledge of the mysteries of God.

We will assign a number to your questions, so that both you and I can easily reference, if necessary, an earlier answer.

The light of Christ "illumines all."[24] May it also illumine us both.

23. 1 Thess 5:5.

24. Exclamation during the readings in the service of the Presanctified Liturgy.

# QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

## 1

**Are we able to distribute holy communion to the sick at any hour whatsoever of the night?**

There does not exist a time for distribution of holy communion to the faithful. Without us needing to return to a very ancient era, to apostolic times, when the Holy Eucharist took place in the evening and Christians communed at that time, we only have to seek the answer in the liturgical practice at present or even a little earlier than our own era. As we know, Sunday and festal Liturgies take place in our land[25] during the morning, and we commune at that time. In Orthodox churches of Europe and America, the Liturgy takes place around noon. During vigils and Pascha, they take place a little after midnight. The Liturgies of the Presanctified, of the eves of Nativity and Theophany, of Great Thursday, and of Great Saturday are evening Liturgies combined also with the service of Vespers. And still nowadays on the Holy Mountain, they take place during the late afternoon. Consequently, and under normal circumstances, holy communion is given even nowadays a little after midnight, in the morning, during the mid-day, and in the late afternoon.

Much more is this the case for a sick one who is in danger of dying and departing the world without the "provision" for eternal life, the "seed of immortality," which would resurrect them "on the last day." Before this need, time and etiquette give way. Besides, for this reason, the Church maintains the Holy Bread in the artophorion for its immediate distribution at hours of need, at whatever hour of the night and day.

---

25. Greece.

## 2

**What is the difference between a martyr, hieromartyr and so forth, and how must they be commemorated?**

Our Church divides its saints into different categories, according to status and the particular service which they offered to her. Thus, in the prayer of the anaphora of Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos, apart from the Theotokos and Forerunner, the various orders of the saints are enumerated: "Forefathers, Fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, ascetics."[26] We find nearly the same division of saints also in the proskomidē, where nearly each one of the nine portions in honor of the saints corresponds more or less to one category, since individual portions are offered for the angels, for the prophets, the apostles, the hierarchs, the martyrs, the ascetics, and so forth. And in the ancient hymn of the service of the Great Compline, which begins with the phrase, "Panagia Lady Theotokos, intercede for us sinners,"[27] a series of invocations follow to the angels, to the Forerunner, to the apostles, prophets, and martyrs, to blessed and God-bearing Fathers, shepherds and teachers of the Church. The well-known troparion, "Apostles, martyrs, and prophets, hierarchs, blessed ones, and righteous,"[28] also enumerates them, which we often chant as an apolytikion on Saturday.

Let us also look at each category separately. When we say "prophet,"[29] we clearly mean, as is apparent, those holy men and women, who, during the period before Christ from the beginning up to also and including John the Baptist, preached the word of God to the Jewish people and prophesized the coming of the Messiah, such as Moses, Elias, Isaiah, and others. "Forefathers"[30] are chiefly the ancestors of Christ from Adam up to and including his immediate ancestors according to the flesh and more broadly also all the holy men of the Old Testament, who lived before Christ, the "righ-

26. "Προπατόρων, Πατέρων, Πατριαρχῶν, Προφητῶν, Ἀποστόλων, Κηρύκων, Εὐαγγελιστῶν, Μαρτύρων, Ὁμολογητῶν, Ἐγκρατευτῶν."
27. "Παναγία Δέσποινα Θεοτόκε, πρέσβευε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν."
28. "Ἀπόστολοι, Μάρτυρες καὶ Προφῆται, Ἱεράρχαι, Ὅσιοι καὶ Δίκαιοι."
29. "Προφήτης."
30. "Προπάτορες."

teous,"[31] such as Enoch, Noah, Esdras, and so forth. "Apostles,"[32] as we know, are the immediate disciples of Christ, the twelve and the seventy, such as Peter and Paul, Andrew, Cleopas, but also the first disciples of the apostles, who themselves also preached the gospel, such as Titus, Timothy, Silas, and others. The "evangelists"[33] also belong to this category, namely the four apostles who wrote the equally numbered canonical gospels and those "equal-to-the-apostles,"[34] namely the saints, who while they were not apostles, offered such great service to Christianity, that in gratitude the Church recognized them as equal in merit to the apostles, such as in the case of the first Christian emperor Kōnstantinos and his mother Helenē, Phōteinē the Samaritan woman, Olga of Russia, and so forth. The "martyrs"[35] are those faithful Christians, who, from the Prōtomartyr Stephanos up until and including our contemporary new martyrs, preferred death, and even a most horrible one, so long as they did not deny Christ and betray the faith of Him who first suffered martyrdom for our salvation of all. Also falling under them are the "hieromartyrs,"[36] namely clergy martyrs, such as Charalampos, Blasios, Hermolaos, and others; the "blessed martyrs,"[37] namely monastic martyrs, such as Nikōn (March 2 or 3) and Eugenia; the "great martyrs,"[38] namely the most celebrated martyrs, who before dying suffered the most gruesome tortures—that they might return to idolatry—such as Geōrgios, Dēmētrios, the Theodōroi, and others; the "virgin martyrs,"[39] women-virgins who suffered martyrdom for Christ, such as Barbara, Aikaterinē, and others; the "blessed virgin martyrs,"[40] namely monastic martyrs, such as Paraskevē; and finally, the "new martyrs,"[41] namely, contemporary Christians who were tortured

31. "Δίκαιοι."
32. "Ἀπόστολοι."
33. "Εὐαγγελισταί."
34. "Ἰσαπόστολοι."
35. "Μάρτυρες."
36. "Ἱερομάρτυρες."
37. "Ὁσιομάρτυρες."
38. "Μεγαλομάρτυρες."
39. "Παρθενομάρτυρες."
40. "Ὁσιοπαρθενομάρτυρες."
41. "Νεομάρτυρες."

and slain by the Turks because they refused to change their faith, such as Geōrgios of Iōannina, Theodōros of Byzantium, Geōrgios of Chios, and many others. Related to the category of martyrs is also the rank of "confessors."[42] These are Christians, who during the era of persecutions were dragged into the courts of idolaters, confessed their faith in Christ, were subjected to martyrdom in order that they might deny Him, but for one reason or another did not suffer death like the martyrs. Such ones are Charitōn, Maximos, and others. "Blessed ones"[43] again are those monastics, men and women, who lived an exemplary monastic life and while they did not offer their blood, they sacrificed their lives and gained heaven with a daily "martyrdom of conscience."[44] In this rank belong Antōnios, Euthymios, Sabas, Athanasios of Athos, Euphrosynē, and a multitude of other men and women. "Hierarchs"[45] and "teachers"[46] are those great bishops, who with holiness and prudence shepherded the people of God and taught through speech or the written word of truth, such as the three hierarchs Basileios, Grēgorios and Iōannēs, Athanasios, and others. Finally, while the title "Fathers"[47] is given in its proper sense to those clergy, who are distinguished by the sanctity of their lives and their correct teaching, which they formulated in their wise writings, it is also generally given to all the holy clergy and monastics.

In its various services, the Church calls upon all these saints as intercessors and with their prayers hopes that her petitions will become more acceptable by God. There exists no service, prayer, or mystery, in which many of the saints are not enumerated. And in the "Save, O God, your people"[48] of the service of Matins and in the Litē, in the blessing of the loaves, in the service of Hagiasmos, and in all the dismissals, many great and universal saints are mentioned by name, and other local ones as well as the saint of the day are added. And for the first group there exists no difficulty, because in our

42. "ἡ τάξις τῶν Ὁμολογητῶν."
43. "Ὅσιοι/Ὁσίαι."
44. "μαρτύριο τῆς συνειδήσεως."
45. "Ἱεράρχαι."
46. "Διδάσκαλοι."
47. "Πατέρες."
48. "Σῶσον ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαόν σου."

printed liturgical books the correct form and epithets are written, which according to ecclesiastical taxis accompany each one of them. The difficulty is found chiefly in the addition of the saint of the day at the end of each dismissal. The cases are not few where we hear that this does not take place in the correct traditional manner. Many priests, and even theologians, do not make even a small effort to be impeccable even in this. Besides, it is not as difficult as it perhaps seems. We should pay attention to the category to which the Church assigns the saint, and the epithets which accompany it. Thus, when it is a prophet, we say: "of the holy and glorious prophet...,"[49] when again it is the case of a righteous one or forefather, we will say: "of the holy and righteous . . . ,"[50] when an apostle: "of the holy glorious and praiseworthy apostle . . . ,"[51] when an evangelist: "of the holy, glorious, praiseworthy apostle and evangelist...,"[52] when a martyr: "of the holy and glorious martyr (great martyr, blessed martyr, confessor, new martyr, and so forth) . . . ,"[53] when a blessed one: "of our blessed and God-bearing father . . . ,"[54] when a hierarch: "of our father among the saints. . .,"[55] when a woman martyr: "of the holy and glorious martyr (great martyr, virgin martyr, blessed martyr, blessed virgin martyr) . . . ,"[56] when a blessed woman: "of our blessed mother . . . ,"[57] and so forth.

Certain saints have their own epithets, such as the Forerunner ("of the honorable and glorious prophet, Forerunner and Baptist John"),[58] John the Theologian ("of the holy glorious apostle and evangelist, virgin, beloved, bosom-friend of Christ, John the Theo-

---

49. "τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἐνδόξου προφήτου . . ."
50. "τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ δικαίου . . ."
51. "τοῦ ἁγίου ἐνδόξου καὶ πανευφήμου ἀποστόλου . . ."
52. "τοῦ ἁγίου, ἐνδόξου, πανευφήμου ἀποστόλου καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ . . ."
53. "τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἐνδόξου μάρτυρος (μεγαλομάρτυρος, ὁσιομάρτυρος, ὁμολογητοῦ, νεομάρτυρος, κλπ.)."
54. "τοῦ ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν . . ."
55. "τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν . . ."
56. "τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ἐνδόξου μάρτυρος (μεγαλομάρτυρος, παρθενομάτυρος, ὁσιομάρτυρος, ὁσιοπαρθενομάρτυρος . . ."
57. "τῆς ὁσίας μητρὸς ἡμῶν . . ."
58. "τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ἐνδόξου προφήτου, Προδρόμου καὶ Βαπτιστοῦ Ἰωάννου."

logian"),[59] Saint Magdalēnē ("of the holy glorious myrrhbearer and equal-to-the-apostles Mary Magdalēnē),[60] Saints Kōnstantinos and Helenē ("of the holy glorious God-crowned sovereigns and equal-to-the-apostles . . ."),[61] and others.

The individual epithet follows after the name of each saint, with which they are identified and distinguished from those having the same name, and for hierarchs, this is the name of their metropolis or eparchy and for other great saints, another which is owed to something especially characteristic of them, for example, "of the wonderworker,"[62] "of the myrrhgusher,"[63] "of the sanctified,"[64] "of the great,"[65] "of the trophy-bearer,"[66] "of the God-bearer,"[67] and so forth.

Particular attention is needed when the name of the saint being celebrated is found among the traditional list of the saints that we are commemorating in the instances above. Then their name would not be commemorated there, but at the end with the phrase "whose memory we also celebrate"[68] or "the commemoration of the recovery of whose holy relics we celebrate."[69] The same applies in the case of the exaltation, procession, finding, veneration, or appearance of the Precious Cross; of the conception, nativity, beheading, and finding of the head of the honorable Forerunner; and for the feasts of the Theotokos, of the garments of the Mother of God, and so forth.

With a little preparation ahead of time and a minimum of good effort, the priest can be irreproachable even on this point of the church service, which perhaps is small and to which few will pay attention, but which for those who know says much about the priest's attentiveness and preparation.

---

59. "τοῦ ἁγίου ἐνδόξου ἀποστόλου καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ, παρθένου, ἠγαπημένου, ἐπιστηθίου φίλου τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ἰωάννου τοῦ Θεολόγου."
60. "τῆς ἁγίας ἐνδόξου μυροφόρου καὶ ἰσαποστόλου Μαρίας τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς."
61. "τῶν ἁγίων ἐνδόξων θεοστέπτων βασιλέων καὶ ἰσαποστόλων . . ."
62. "τοῦ θαυματουργοῦ."
63. "τοῦ μυροβλήτου."
64. "τοῦ ἡγιασμένου."
65. "τοῦ μεγάλου."
66. "τοῦ τροπαιοφόρου."
67. "τοῦ Θεοφόρου."
68. "οὗ καὶ τὴν μνήμην ἐπιτελοῦμεν."
69. "οὗ τὴν ἀνάμνησιν τῆς ἀνακομιδῆς τῶν ἁγίων λειψάνων ἑορτάζομεν."

## 3

**Must we give holy communion without restriction to all?**

## 4

**Are we able to forbid a certain Christian who has a mortal sin from communing? If so, then in what manner?**

## 5

**Must we commune Christians, who previously we have urged to confess and are approaching unprepared?**

All three questions refer to the difficult subject of the distribution of holy communion to the faithful by the priest. I say difficult because from one perspective they are connected with the subject of the priest's responsibility as an accountable administrator of the mysteries before God, and from another they are connected with the conscience of the believer, as well as with the particular circumstances of each parish. There are so many circumstances that no one can either foresee or judge with the same standards. Each human being is an individual case and, according to the holy Apostle Paul, no one knows "the thoughts of a human being" except His Spirit alone.[70] Besides this, we must not forget that our religion is a religion of freedom and grace and that all our energies must aim towards the human being's salvation alone, for whom Christ died and for whose redemption He gave His Body, "which was broken for us, for remission of sins," and His Blood, "which was shed for us for the remission of sins," as it is repeated in every Liturgy. This is also precisely the presupposition of the mystery: the remission of the sins of sinners and not the reward for sinlessness.

From another perspective stand the exhortations of the Apostle Paul (1 Cor 11:27–32) and the Church for preparation before holy communion, the "examination," in order for our participation in the mystery to be helpful and "lest to judgement or condemnation." The mysteries, our noetic pearls, are not to be cast to swine, because they

70. 1 Cor 2:11.

would trample them and would profane them. And from here, the responsibility of the priest begins.

Now, the enlightened faithful priest will find the medium between these two points, which suits each individual. When catechizing his Christians, he will neither embolden them so much that they will approach holy communion unprepared, nor terrify them so much that they will deprive themselves of the cup of life out of an exaggerated consideration of their sinfulness. The standard is found in the exhortation of the Divine Liturgy, which many times we say or hear so mechanically and without understanding the meaning: "With fear of God, faith and love, draw near."[71] The "fear of God" repels the sinful human being from participation in the Lord's supper. Perfect "love" draws them and according to the Apostle John, "casts out the fear."[72] And "faith" will achieve the sacred union of these two poles and will give to the faithful person the correct way to place themselves before God and His mysteries. The priest with all his pastoral work must look towards the strengthening, growth, and enlightenment of this faith. Thus, fewer problems will present themselves like also those which are raised in these three questions, because Christians being consciously guided in due time and catechized in the mysteries by their priest will know when and how they will approach holy communion.

And something more. These questions presuppose the ideal relationship between a priest and his flock. The priest knows by name and recognizes the problems of the faithful of his parish, confesses them, monitors them, guides them in the Christian life, with one word, "he shepherds" them. Unfortunately, nowadays this is not possible everywhere, especially in the large cities, with crowded parishes and few shepherds. Of those who are approaching for holy communion in the hundreds during Pascha and the Nativity, it is questionable whether the priest might know a small percentage.

Following these general points, let us come to examine your questions more closely.

---

71. "Μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ, πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης προσέλθετε."
72. 1 John 4:18.

In principle, we may not give holy communion to all without restriction. Holy communion is given only to the faithful, namely, to those who with baptism became members of the Church and belong to her and are found in mystical union with her. In other words, only Orthodox Christians may receive communion. Excluded are non-Christians (consequently also unbaptized infants), Christians who belong to another church (Catholics, Protestants, Armenians, Copts, and so forth), schismatics, and those officially excommunicated by the Church. Holy communion is the symbol and constituent element of the Christian Church, of the family in Christ. It makes the people of God "one flesh" and "one blood." It makes us siblings in Christ, whatever the place, race, language, and era to which we belong, since all of us partake "from the one bread" and from the "same cup" and in our veins runs the Blood of Christ and our body has become like His Body. The priest not only cannot, but also bears a heavy blame if he might distribute holy communion to those who are not members of this community. When they enter our Church, then they will also partake of our communion.

However, our Church also imposes as a pedagogical punishment, "penance," the deprivation of holy communion, on people who have fallen into certain sins. Hence, this occurred also in the ancient church, where there existed a special rank of "repenting" Christians. For certain of these, holy communion was not only forbidden, but also attendance of the Divine Liturgy, aside from only the hearing of the readings and preaching. The duration of exclusion from holy communion lasted even up to the deathbed in certain cases of great sins, such as the denial of Christ. With the passage of time, the Church became more and more lenient. It is sufficient for anyone to compare the canons of Basileios the Great with the canons of Iōannēs the Faster and with contemporary practice in order to see the gradual lessening of strictness. The imposition of this penance took place and takes place during confession by the spiritual father. Naturally, the latter would do this with all his love and psychological adroitness, so that the one being confessed might be persuaded that this takes place for their own good and for their spiritual salvation. If a great sin of one of his parishioners comes to the notice of the

priest, the same thing occurs. Then, before they might approach for holy communion, the priest would ensure to approach with love and care, and to indicate to them paternally the appropriate remedy, and possibly, to recommend to them abstinence from holy communion. At the hour of approaching the mystery, it is too late, and a comment at that moment could become a cause for the one approaching to be hurt, and our admonition would bring about the opposite result, distancing them far from the Church; or further, for becoming a cause of the priest himself falling into a mortal sin, violating the confidentiality of the confessional, and thus becoming guilty before God and man.

If again, it is not a matter regarding anything confidential, but the one approaching has become a cause of public scandal, the priest may refuse them holy communion with all his love, Christian civility, and decorum, either requesting to see them at the end or acting in another more tactful and sensitive way, so that the Christian "fallen ill" might be gained and not lost. Saint Ambrose of Milan also did something analogous regarding the emperor Theodosios the slayer of Thessalonians.[73] In any event, even in this case, we must not forget that it is too late for us to wait until the moment of holy communion to counsel the faithful. If the sinner is the "lost sheep," great is the blame of the shepherd who left it to wander in the hills and become a prey of the noetic wolf and did not run after it from the first moment. In each case, let the priest ask himself what Christ would do, if He was in his place.

Finally, on the third point of the questions, namely if the priest might keep from holy communion those whom he advised to confess and who did not confess, I think that the answer is not so difficult. The priest ought to urge the faithful to approach prepared as much as possible for holy communion. He should recommend ways of preparing, one of which is also confession. From there onwards, it is a question of the conscience of the believer. It is good for the believer to have confessed before holy communion and to receive remission of their sins. Thus, they approach more worthily and less fearful of

73. Saint Ambrose placed the Byzantine emperor Theodosios I (r. 379–395) under penance for ordering the massacre of Thessaloniki (390).

condemnation. However, the priest must not forget that confession is one mystery and holy communion is another. The second does not presuppose the first. Repentance is an autonomous and independent mystery, to which the Christian does not approach daily, but when they have felt the need for spiritual healing, for confession, and for remission of sins, which weigh upon them. Holy communion is the nourishment, the fountain of immortality, the manna, the "true food and drink." And to it, one approaches as frequently as possible, "so as not to die." For this reason, also, the Divine Liturgy is celebrated almost on a daily basis. And you invite all the people present to holy communion with "draw near" and for them you pray before communion that they receive communion worthily and afterwards you give thanks to the Master who loves humankind on their behalf.

Let me write it again: For these serious problems such as the distribution of the Body and Blood of the Lord to the faithful, the key is found in the hands of the good, prudent priest full of love and fear of God. He does not need anything except this to open the hearts of his parishioners in order that their Bridegroom might enter.

## 6

**Is it perhaps necessary for us modern priests to create another canon, analogous to the "liturgical" canon of our Fathers? And must this canon perhaps be "social" to regulate the relations of people outside of the temple?**

It is not strange, reverend father, that such questions are born within your soul indeed at the beginning of your priestly vocation. For the first time, when you came into contact with your flock, you felt its problems, lived with them, and, like a conscientious shepherd, you attempted to help in their solution. Afterall, you are describing several of them and are in anguish about the new situation, which has taken shape in your village's community during recent years.

However, do not think that what is missing for us is the "social" canon, which would order people's relationships and would solve their problems. If only the problems of our society could be solved with regulations and prescriptions, it would be the easiest thing. Be-

sides, this canon exists. It was given to us by revelation with the perfect law of grace and love, and the Christian Church has struggled now for centuries to realize it in the world, permanently bound to the words, "Your kingdom come" and "Your will be done on earth as it is in heaven," and attempting in word and deed to influence hearts and to direct humanity's energies towards this purpose.

However, do not forget that the world "lies in the power of the evil one"[74] and "the kingdom of God is within us."[75] You should do everything to help your brethren and to comfort them, nevertheless focusing everything on the salvation of their souls, on establishment of the kingdom of God in their hearts. If this might take place, then all their problems have been solved, I mean not "what will we eat, or what we will drink, or what will we wear,"[76] concerning which, besides, they look after sufficiently both on their own and with the help of a variety of organizations, but their eternal problems, their salvation in Christ, their spiritual conduct, the redemption from the burden of sin, and their deliverance in Christ. This is your work and for this you shall give an accounting to God on that fearful day; and his representative on earth and also your superior, the bishop, shall judge your performance in this area.

If you see things this way, then you will understand the meaning of the "liturgical canon" of our Fathers. In the mysteries and by the mysteries, which you administer, humanity will find salvation. These are the sources of grace which, with the love of God the Father, the redeeming sacrifice of Christ, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, shall regenerate, strengthen, nourish, increase, make firm, forgive, and make your parishioners those bearing fruits in works of love and heirs of the kingdom of God. You shall guide them to the genuine springs of the water of life and you shall not let them drink from "broken wells." You shall also teach them to pray with you "in one voice and one heart" to their Father with the prayers of the Church, to praise God with you with hymns and troparia, which our Church's saints composed. You shall catechize them to learn what and how they

74. 1 John 5:19.
75. Luke 17:21, modified, to read "us" instead of "you."
76. Matt 6:31.

must believe. You shall help them to approach the mysteries consciously and to draw grace and strength from them. And if thus you make them good Christians, their many problems shall be solved or shall lose their original acuteness and the fruits of their social relations will not be delayed in appearing.

And during the era of our Fathers, a thousand problems, famines, misfortunes, epidemics, disasters, wars, massacres, plunders, and persecutions existed. But the Church correctly trusting in the word of the Lord, "seek ye first the kingdom of God and all these things shall be added to you,"[77] emphasized eternal and "enduring" things, preferring them to the transitory and ephemeral. Struggle also on the same route with them and have no doubt that in this way you shall also complete your main work, when guiding your sheep to the "pastures of salvation,"[78] and you shall contribute much to the solution of their problems and living together in peace.

## 7

**If there might be a priest at the graveyard, is it necessary for the priest of the parish to accompany the deceased all the way there?**

I consider as absolutely necessary that the priest of the parish accompany the deceased to the cemetery for two reasons:

**First for liturgical reasons.** From the moment when the body is received from the home[79] for transfer to the temple, where the funeral service will be chanted, a type of procession with continual chanting is formed, which is not interrupted with the dismissal of the funeral service but also continues up to the grave and ends with

77. Matt 6:33.

78. cf. John 10:9.

79. This refers to the home of the deceased, and not a funeral home, which is the custom elsewhere. According to older village customs in Greece, if a person died in the early morning or overnight, the funeral was generally in the afternoon. However, if the death occurred in the afternoon or early evening, the body would be displayed in the home of the deceased until its burial the next morning. The older custom was to bury the deceased within twenty-four hours. For a study of such practices, see Loring M. Danforth, *The Death Rituals of Rural Greece* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982).

the interment of the deceased. The ancient Euchologia provide for the chanting of the trisagion, the "All Holy Trinity,"[80] and the "Our Father," and, after the burial of the remains and the covering of the grave, the troparia, "Among the spirits of the righteous,"[81] and so forth. Most characteristic is the practice in the funeral service of monks, where during the transfer from the temple to the grave, the idiomela are chanted, "What pleasure of life"[82] and so forth, but three stops take place along the way and each time a petition and prayer is done. At the time that the grave is covered, other troparia are chanted and twelve prostrations follow on behalf of the one who has "fallen asleep." The same thing is also done in the service "for a priest who has died," at the time of the transfer from the temple to the grave "the priests chant the heirmoi of the great canon," the trisagion, "In your place of rest, O Lord,"[83] and so forth. And in the three instances, "a final dismissal" takes place only after the burial. If you also observed the procession of the epitaphios at the end of Great Saturday Matins, where indeed there is a transference to Christ of the funereal customs of the Christian Church, you would see precisely the same thing: a proper procession with chanting, lights, censers, liturgical fans, priests, and so forth, which escort the dead Christ to the grave.

These all show how the Church always encompassed the dead bodies of her children with particular reverence and accompanied them with much piety to their final dwelling place on earth. And as nowadays the procession of the epitaphios without the requisite sacred cortege would be unthinkable, so also the transfer of the deceased to the grave is unthinkable without the priest and the church cortege.

Fortunately, these things are observed in the small parishes of our towns and villages. In the large cities, necessity has confined this most sacred cortege to the symbolic presence of the priest, who sits right next to the driver of the hearse (!) with his epitrachēlion and a

80. "Παναγία Τριάς."
81. "Μετὰ πνεύματων δικαίων."
82. "Ποία τοῦ βίου τρυφή."
83. "Εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν σου Κύριε . . ."

cross. Albeit even a weak remnant of the proper church practice it must certainly be observed. The priest receives the deceased believer and does not leave them until after they are placed into the grave. For this reason, also, the correct thing to do would be for the same one to bury them, when committing his parishioner to the earth, and not to "hand them over" to the chaplain of the graveyard for the remainder.

But by now also the second reason appeared for which the priest is obligated to accompany the deceased at least to the cemetery. *It is a pastoral reason, also a reason of humanity.* The priest is the father of his spiritual child. Would it ever be conceivable for a father not to accompany his dead child to the grave, but to leave this task to the gravediggers?

In cases such as these, more than at any other time, the opportunity is given to the Church to show her care and love both to the deceased—who, even though they died, she does not stop from considering as an inseparable member of the church community, since the death in Christ "of those who believe"[84] is nothing other than "sleep"—and to their relations, in the hearts of which, she ought to instill all consolation and hope, and to use this event as a means to draw them much closer to Christ and to His Church.

## 8

**If he might find himself in need, can a priest celebrate Paraklēsis or another service without an epitrachēlion?**

Metropolitan Gabriēl of Pentapolis submitted a similar question to Symeōn of Thessaloniki (d. 1429). Gabriēl asked why during sacred rites is it necessary to use vestments, since the priest with his ordination personally himself has the grace of the Holy Spirit, and if it is possible "without an epitrachēlion to perform the rite" (Question Seventeen).[85] Symeōn responds that while the priest has grace, the mysteries are also composed of a material element, just as humanity is composed of body and soul. And he concludes: "For

84. cf. Matt 18:6; Mark 9:42; John 17:20; Rom 4:11.
85. PG 155:868c.

which reason also, there is a need for sacred vestments and without an epitrachēlion the priest must not do anything, since also the sacred vestments have divine grace, because each of them also has a spiritual significance and each is given through a hierarchical blessing."[86] Consequently, he expressly forbids the celebration of every rite by the priest without an epitrachēlion ("to celebrate not one rite without an epitrachēlion").[87]

Indeed, the epitrachēlion is the emblem of the priest's priesthood and the symbol of the grace of the Holy Spirit, which was poured out on him through the mystery of the priesthood, as he states also when he puts it on: "Blessed is God who pours forth his grace upon His priests."[88] When the priest celebrates a rite or a mystery, he does not celebrate it on his own behalf as a man, but as God's priest and a representative of the Church, on whose behalf he entreats at that time through prayers established by the latter. From the moment when he would vest himself with it, the priest becomes the instrument of grace, the celebrant, the vessel of the Holy Spirit.

Again, according to Symeōn, "what is usually done in the monasteries by the priests in the Midnight Office, Hours, and Complines" is performed without the epitrachēlion. And nowadays in parish temples, the Midnight Office and the Ninth Hour are celebrated without an epitrachēlion.

But what if a need might arise for the priest to celebrate one of the other services and he does not have an epitrachēlion? Again, Symeōn of Thessaloniki answers, that if there might be an absolute need for "a rite or prayer or baptism or another of the sacred rites" to take place and it is impossible for an epitrachēlion to be found, "in order that the work not be abandoned" the priest should take a belt or a piece of cord or material, bless it, vest himself with it as an epitrachēlion, and celebrate the service. After the service, he recommends that this material no longer be considered as common material, but, either employed in some sacred use, if it can be used,

86. PG 155:868c–868d.
87. PG 155:868c–868d.
88. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἐκχέων τὴν χάριν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς αὐτοῦ."

or kept somewhere so that it would not be desecrated. Symeōn recommends these things.[89]

As regards Paraklēsis, Matins, or Vespers, I think that they can be celebrated in necessity by the priest without the epitrachēlion with the "Through the prayers . . . ,"[90] as takes places in monasteries by monks by themselves or also by laypeople when the priest is not present. Naturally then whatever the priest would say is omitted, when he would serve as a priest, namely when he puts on his priestly vestment or epitrachēlion.

## 9

**What epitrachēlion has the more correct form, that which is made from two narrow strips or that which is made from a single broad fabric?**

The original form of the epitrachēlion was similar to the form of the deacon's orarion, namely, likewise it was made from a single narrow strip of fabric, but its two ends, instead of one falling forward and the other backward as in case of the orarion, the two both came down in front. Thus, the epitrachēlion encircled the neck[91] of the priest and was worn in a manner upon or around his neck. From its placement, it took its name ("epitrachēlion" or "peritrachēlion") and exactly to this placement also is owed the symbolisms that were given to it by the sacred commentators of the sacred services, namely that it symbolizes the yoke of Christ or the grace of the Holy Spirit which is poured out upon the priest. The epitrachēlion has exactly this form also in ancient murals and icons, where we also see its two ends falling towards the front and certainly the one nearly covering the other. In the West, this vestment maintains nearly the same form. And during the celebration of services, Roman Catholic priests wear a narrow strip of fabric, which is hung from the neck and its two ends fall to the front.

89. PG 155:868d–869a.
90. "Δι' εὐχῶν . . ."
91. "τράχηλος." Phountoulēs is emphasizing the derivation of the vestment's name from its wearing around or upon the "neck" of the priest.

In ancient manuscripts of the Euchologia, according to the description of the presbyter's ordination, it is said that the bishop also brings the other end of the orarion to the front saying the word "Worthy,"[92] without another epitrachēlion outside of this one being placed on the newly ordained priest. During ordinations, some hierarchs even maintain this today. But here we see the ancient practice, the epitrachēlion in its original form, namely, the strip whose two ends fall unconnected to the front, and the one is found nearly on top of the other, as in the icons.

Later, in order to stay better, these two ends are connected with small bands, bells, or knots. In this way, the present-day form of the double epitrachēlion resulted, which is also more consistent with the ancient tradition and aesthetically more beautiful, but also more practical in folding and transporting. Many ancient epitrachēlia in this form are preserved in the skeuophylakia of great temples and sacred monasteries with gold-embroidered images of saints, angels, or other ornaments.

The subsequent one-piece epitrachēlion has a form incompatible with its history and is inferior aesthetically. It would be desirable for our priests to slowly return to the ancient and beautiful double epitrachēlion, while from now on avoiding the fabrication of new tasteless broad epitrachēlia.

## 10

### When there is an Artoklasia, is the name of the person celebrating the feast also commemorated during the great entrance of the Divine Liturgy?[93]

In principle, there exists no relationship between these two services, namely, between the Artoklasia and the Divine Liturgy. In parishes, we are accustomed to seeing the Artoklasia being performed at the end of Vespers, at the end of Matins, namely after the doxology, and

92. "Ἄξιος."

93. "Celebrating the feast" is a way of describing the celebration of one's "name day," which is usually the day that the saint is commemorated after which one is named. In some regions, there is a modern Greek custom to baptize a child on the day of the saint for which they were named.

sometimes also at the end of the Liturgy, depending on the customs that are prevalent in various locales and depending on the attendance of the people and of those celebrating the feast who perform the Artoklasia. In this way, the impression remains for us is that all this, and especially the Matins with the Liturgy and the Artoklasia, have a kind of unity.

However, if we wish to look into the origins of these services, as well as also contemporary monastic practice, which preserves more exactly than the parish practice, the original, sometimes even the most intact, form of services, we will see that it is a matter of purely separate things. The Artoklasia, the "blessing of the loaves," is a completely separate service, the original position of which is found at the end of the Great Vespers of the all-night vigils. Consequently, it does not have any connection with the Liturgy. But even if it might be performed at the end of Matins, again it is separate from the Liturgy, even though in terms of timing it is found closer to it than if it might be performed at the end of Vespers. Let us note that according to the monastic Typika, the Liturgy is not performed consecutively with Matins; the service of the First Hour intervenes, a complete dismissal occurs and, after nearly an hour-long break, the Third and Sixth Hours are chanted, and afterwards, the Divine Liturgy is performed. However, even in parishes, the one celebrating the feast, who provides for the Artoklasia, does not also necessarily offer the elements for the Holy Eucharist. Consequently, in this case, the Liturgy is not performed specifically for the one who is celebrating the feast.

The conclusion from what we write is clear. Since an Artoklasia and a Liturgy are two separate rites, the one who celebrates[94] the Artoklasia would not be commemorated during the Divine Liturgy, except if the same person also celebrates the Divine Liturgy and also offers the required elements for the Divine Liturgy together with the loaves of the Artoklasia.

94. This does not mean that a layperson officiates the Artoklasia or Divine Liturgy, but that by offering the elements, whether loaves/oil/wine (Artoklasia) or prosphora/wine (Eucharist), in this manner, directly contributes to the celebration of the service, and in this way, "celebrates."

But over and above what we said, namely, strictly speaking, the conscience of the priest stands as shepherd and father of his parish for the case in point. The priest would not be prevented from commemorating the one or the ones celebrating their feast during the Divine Liturgy, since they are living members of his parish; even if they celebrate only an Artoklasia, he might believe that this would result in strengthening the ties of the members of his church and result in their spiritual benefit.

## 11

**During the great entrance, does the priest commemorate names, and especially, the names of the living or departed founders of the temple?**

It is known that the tradition has become established that at the time of the great entrance apart from the general and collective words, "May the Lord God remember all of you in His kingdom . . . ,"[95] specifically commemorated are the hierarch of the area, the rulers, various ranks of faithful, and, particularly by name, the faithful who provided the gifts, as well as the names of those who have "fallen asleep." This custom perhaps has its beginnings in the ancient tradition of commemorating those who made the various offerings in the holy prothesis. However, this does not appear very old, since it is not encountered in liturgical manuscripts prior to the eighteenth century. Certainly, several hierarchs have forbidden this commemoration during the great entrance in order that various excesses are avoided that sometimes accompany it, such as the showing off of learnedness by certain educated priests, who are pleased with flowery archaic language; the commemoration of names of "gold-ringed" (according to the holy apostle James [Iakōvos]) parishioners,[96] and people-pleasing; the syntactical errors of some less educated priests; and the unnecessary prolongation of the great entrance with the commemoration of a series of names of those living and dead.

95. "Πάντων ὑμῶν μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ . . ."
96. Jas 2:2.

However, it is good for the commemoration to be the plainest and most limited as possible where the custom has become established. In private Liturgies, where a few believers are present who celebrate the Liturgy, it would not be senseless for their names to be commemorated.[97] However, when it is the case of the Sunday Liturgy or that of great feasts, which are celebrated by the entire Christian community and for all the faithful, it is inappropriate for the offering to be narrowed only to those who happened to offer the gifts. The priest would commemorate these in the holy prothesis and in the diptychs of the Divine Liturgy. Sometimes what is heard in cases of grandiose memorial services is particularly inappropriate, where during the great entrance some priests are accustomed to adding, to the name of the deceased, also the phrase, "on behalf of whom this bloodless anaphora [or sacrifice] is offered"[98] or something similar. The Liturgy of Sundays and that of feasts is offered for all Christians, those present and not present, the living and dead, and not only for the privileged one who has "fallen asleep."

Now, specifically concerning the remembrance of founders. The Church is always praying for those "who love the beauty of the house"[99] of the Lord and especially for those who are piously inclined to donate money and to defray the costs for building and restoring sacred temples. In exceptional cases, such as the dedication of the temple, the commemoration of the dedication, the temple's feast, or the memorial service of its founders, it is right for them to be commemorated by name, if their names are known for certain. But their continual repetition in every Liturgy

97. In the Church of Greece, so-called "private Liturgies" are celebrated in small chapels on private lands or those belonging to parishes and monasteries. These Liturgies are celebrated on the basis of ad hoc requests from the faithful, often out of affinity or spiritual obligation to the saint for whom the chapel is dedicated. Although these ad hoc Liturgies are technically open to others, they are not part of the official parish calendar nor even made known to other congregants. The phrase "we opened the church" (ἀνοίξαμε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν) is an expression often heard in villages after a family has arranged and provided for the celebration of such a Liturgy, especially in the case of chapels not normally used.

98. "ὑπὲρ οὗ ἡ ἀναίμακτος αὕτη ἀναφορά (ἢ θυσία) προσφέρεται."

99. "ἀγαπῶντας τὴν εὐπρέπεια τοῦ οἴκου."

will be burdensome to those present and will not pleasing to God, and the priest will not only be in danger of being branded as a people-pleaser, but he will even be at odds with the Christian humility of the same pious founders.

## 12

**In old Euchologia of the Venetian edition, in the prayer of the eighth day from birth we read, "... and grant, Lord, to remain ἀνεξάρνητον..."[100] while in the modern Euchologia we read, "... and grant, Lord to remain ἀνεξάρτητον...."[101] Which is more correct, "ἀνεξάρνητον" or "ἀνεξάρτητον?"**

This beautiful observation of the reverend presbyter gives us the opportunity to say a few words regarding publications of our liturgical books, which are necessary in order to understand the answer not only to this question, but also to a multitude of others that are arising among those, who do not simply use liturgical books to read prayers and services hurriedly, but who attempt to understand the meaning of the prayers and the sacred services with attention and a critical spirit. For this reason, precisely, this priest is worthy of particular praise, as also those others similar to him who wish to be "ones who understand" those things that they celebrate and not mechanical liturgical instruments.

As we all know, printing is a relatively modern invention. In the beginning, expert calligraphers wrote all books by hand on papyrus, on parchment, namely, on specially treated animal skins, and later, on paper, at first with capital and later with small letters. Specifically, most of the time, liturgical books were written in monasteries, where there existed special workshops of monastic calligraphers. Many such manuscripts exist in various libraries in the world, such as in Athens, Rome, Paris, London, and Vienna, and in libraries of monasteries, such as in Sinai, Jerusalem, the Holy Mountain, and in many other places. It was to be expected with so many copies that the different prayers, troparia, and other liturgical texts often

100. "... καὶ δός, Κύριε, ἀνεξάρνητον μεῖναι..."
101. "... καὶ δός, Κύριε, ἀνεξάρτητον μεῖναι..."

display mistakes consistent with the grammatical knowledge and attentiveness of the copyists, whether spelling mistakes, or from a bad reading of an older manuscript, or even acoustically, because the copying often had taken place by dictation.

When printing was discovered in the fifteenth century, various publishers or scholars began slowly to publish our liturgical books in the West, especially in Venice, where there existed great Greek printing houses. However, these first editions were not, as it was to be expected, faultless publications. Human beings made them, who, despite all their good intentions, had neither the knowledge nor the means to examine and correct the texts. They were reliant on one or two manuscripts that they considered the best and printed them with as much care as possible. However, in this manner, they preserved the chance errors of their manuscripts, to which they also added printing errors. Nevertheless, the evil was perpetuated, because modern editions were often always reprintings of older editions and had their same errors plus also new misprints.

The matter did not remain unnoticed by clerical scholars and by the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and for this reason various educated clergy intermittently formed committees for the correction of the liturgical books or undertook their correction officially or unofficially. The most significant effort was made by Bartholomaios Koutloumousianos,[102] from Imbros, who corrected many errors in quite a few of our liturgical books. In any case, the work is difficult, because the various liturgical books must first be studied and published critically, namely on the basis of all, or at least, the most important

102. Bartholomaios Koutloumousianos (Βαρθολομαῖος Κουτλουμουσιανός) (1772–1851) was a hieromonk associated with the Monastery of Koutloumousiou (Μονὴ Κουτλουμουσίου) on Mount Athos, editor of liturgical books, and teacher. Among his accomplishments, he published editions of the Mikron Proseuchētarion (Small Prayerbook) (1828), Mega Hōrologion (1832 and 1841), Pentēkostarion (1836), Triōdion (1839 and 1850), and the twelve Mēnaia (1843–1849). This discussion is based on Μ.Ἰ. Γεδεών, "Κουτλουμουσιανός, Βαρθολομαῖος," in *MEE* 15:92. For additional information, see Δημήτριος Στρατής, *Βαρθολομαῖος Κουτλουμουσιανός (1772–1851) Βιογραφία - Ἐργογραφία* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἀριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, 1999).

manuscripts, a matter which has not yet taken place. For this reason, also, efforts up until now have yielded very few results.

Let us now examine "ἀνεξάρτητον" or "ἀνεξάρνητον." The first word means "independent," "self-reliant," that which is not contingent on something else." The second, a compound from the verb "ἐξαρνοῦμαι" and the negative prefix "ἀ(ν)," means something that someone does not deny, does not renounce, does not recant, but adheres steadfastly to and professes unceasingly. The prayer, in which the word is found, is the "prayer for the sealing of a child when it receives a name on the eighth day after its birth."[103] This prayer is very old, and it was read initially to those persons who presented themselves to the priests of the Church and declared that they desired to become a Christian. Thereupon, their names were registered in the books of Christian candidates, of catechumens, and "they were sealed," namely they were blessed by the sign of the cross on the forehead, mouth, and breast by the priest. The prayer is also referring precisely to this: to the sign of the cross, to the desire of the person to flee from the "vanity of the world," and to follow the "commandments" of Christ. They beg to remain steadfast to the Christian confession and to be worthy "in due time" of holy baptism and holy communion. From that moment, the one who comes forward to bear the precious name of Christ begins to be called a Christian catechumen. For this reason, precisely, the prayer asks that they not become a denier (ἀρνητής), denying[104] the holy name of Christ, but to advance for baptism unshakeable and steadfast and to remain a faithful Christian for the rest of their life. The phrase, "ἀνεξάρνητον μεῖναι τὸ ὄνομά σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτόν" ("that your holy

103. "εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ κατασφραγίσαι παιδίον, λαμβάνον ὄνομα τῇ ὀγδοῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς γεννήσεως αὐτοῦ." The word "seal" (σφραγίς) and associated terms can refer to the sign of the cross traced on a person or to an anointing. In this case, the title of the rite is referring to the "signing" or tracing of the form of the cross and not an anointment. For a brief discussion of this use, see Byron David Stuhlman, *The Initiatory Process in the Byzantine Tradition, Texts in Translation from Early Manuscripts of the Euchology and Typikon of the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, with a brief commentary*, Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies 18 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2009), 17.

104. "ἔξαρνος."

name may remain undenied on him") has this meaning. The word "ἀνεξάρτητον" has no place here.

When infant baptism later became prevalent, the presentation of the baby at the temple was connected with the name-giving on the eighth day in imitation of the Judaic practice and of the Lord's circumcision on the eighth day and name-giving. The significance remained the same: the baby "is sealed," is blessed, is given a name, and thus begins already to be called a Christian. The priest prays that the name of Christ remains "undenied" by the new offspring of the Christian Church.

Now as to how "ἀνεξάρτητον" came to be found. All the manuscripts and old editions have the correct "ἀνεξάρνητον." In some particular edition of Venice (because it is also contained in some of them) either from a misprint (as is more likely) or because the proofreader did not understand the meaning of the difficult word "ἀνεξάρνητον," he replaced it with the familiar "ἀνεξάρτητον." Moreover, the two words only differ from one another by one letter. All modern Greek editions, even the official ones, accepted the mistaken reading, perpetuated it, and repeat the incorrect "ἀνεξάρτητον" instead of the correct "ἀνεξάρνητον." They also do this, despite the meaning and despite the manuscripts, the early editions, the researched edition of the Euchologion of Rome, and the ancient translations, which all have "ἀνεξάρνητον," and despite the recent critical restoration that Professor P. Trempelas did on the basis of the manuscripts of Athens in his work, *Small Euchologion* (volume 1, Athens 1950, page 324).[105]

I wish that this would be the only error that is found in our liturgical books.

105. Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 2 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1950–1955), 1:32.

## 13

**We read in the Fiftieth Psalm, "For behold I was conceived (συνελήφθην) in transgressions and my mother ἐκίσσησε me in sins."[106] Why does it say "ἐκίσσησε" and not "ἐκύησε?" What does "ἐκίσσησε" mean and why was it used?**

The second half verse of verse seven of the Fiftieth Psalm in all editions of the Holy Scriptures and in all our liturgical books has "and my mother ἐκίσσησε me in sins." The verb "κισσάω," according to lexicons, means "to have an appetite for unusual food, in the case of a pregnant woman." In other words, this phrase means whatever more or less the preceding half verse means, "that in sins I was conceived," to which it is paralleled according to the known meter of the Hebrew poetry, the "synonymous parallelism." The two phrases wish to emphasize the sinfulness of humanity, which is steeped in sin from its conception. The word "ἐκύησε" means more or less the same thing (to conceive, to be pregnant), but this reading does not exist anywhere, except if whatever we have said concerning "ἀνεξάρνητον" (which was replaced by the more familiar "ἀνεξάρτητον") might also occur concerning this word in some poor edition or in a recitation of the psalm from memory.

## 14

**Why do we read the Ninth Hour before each Vespers, while we omit the First, Third, and Sixth, which are read only during the Great Lent?**

The services of the First, Third, Sixth, and Ninth Hours are clearly monastic services, which slowly entered into the practice of parishes from the monasteries, where also at that time and up until now they are performed normally on all days of the year, whether it is Lent or not. And while the First Hour is performed in connection with Matins, the Third and Sixth are performed before Divine Liturgy during the time of the proskomidē and the Ninth before Vespers in the afternoon. When these services also began to be performed in

106. "Ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἐν ἀνομίαις συνελήφθην, καὶ ἐν ἁμαρτίαις ἐκίσσησέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου."

the parish temples, it was natural that they could not conform to the hours of the day for which originally they were intended, namely for the present 7:00, 9:00, and 12:00 morning hours and the 3:00 afternoon hour, because the people were not able to abandon their occupations and livelihoods and to be in the temple nearly all day. Thus, all were gathered together in great groups, as takes place in parishes during Great Lent, when all are read together during the morning, between the services of Matins and Vespers, like it was one great unified service. On other days, only the Ninth Hour was preserved where all along it was connected with Vespers, like a remembrance of the old liturgical practice, while the other Hours are omitted, since it became prevalent for the Divine Liturgy to be joined immediately with Matins. The morning service was sufficiently long and would have become unbearable in its length if it had preserved the three Hours, which are presently omitted.

In the Slavic churches, where they maintained the earlier Typikon more faithfully, the Hours continue to be read according to nearly the same taxis in which they are read in monasteries, namely the First Hour together with the Matins, which is chanted like a small all-night vigil during the night before, the Third and Sixth before the Divine Liturgy at 9:00 in the morning, and the Ninth before Vespers.

## 15

**Issues that a peculiar Artoklasia generates which takes place in Epirus.**

A priest writes us:

"In my parish where I was ordained as a new priest, I see my parishioners celebrate the Artoklasia at the end of the Divine Liturgy and outside of the sacred temple in the forecourt of the church with prosphora, which they have cut like antidōron and are giving to the faithful, who are kissing the icon of the saint being celebrated and leaving in the church's tray whatever they please. Must we embrace this custom, which has very much taken hold in the souls of the

faithful, or is it uncanonical and must the Artoklasia take place, as customary, in Vespers or before, 'Blessed is the Kingdom . . . ?' "[107]

As we wrote when responding to question ten, the Artoklasia is a service, whose normal place is found at the end of the Vespers of all-night vigils. As Symeōn of Thessaloniki observes, when a vigil is not celebrated, a blessing of loaves also does not take place, "because it was prescribed specifically owing to the fatigue of the vigil, that the brothers after having obtained blessed bread of Christ and a small refreshment owing to the fatigue, thereafter may have prayer for communion of the awesome mysteries, and especially the clergy" (*Dialogue*, chapter 342).[108] This is the original purpose of the Artoklasia and its normal place in the system of sacred services in our Church's daily prayer cycle. This also takes place presently in the sacred monasteries.

However, let us remember again that principle, which regulates our ecclesiastical rites. Namely, when they are transferred from the monasteries to the parishes, they undergo certain modifications that are imposed by the circumstances, in which, the faithful live in the world. In this manner, the purpose of the sacred rite, namely, the sanctification of the faithful for the reception of the sanctified bread and the form of the rite with the hymns and prayers, like they were done in the monasteries, was maintained for the Artoklasia. But the time of its performance was not implemented in the same way. It was transferred to the end of Vespers for feast days, even also if an all-night vigil did not take place, or to the end of Matins, if sometimes particular needs required it, and at the end of Liturgy. Therefore, in principle, nothing unusual or uncanonical is observed in the case that we described. Simply, here, the local custom imposes as a rule what takes place elsewhere as an exception.

Speaking about the first half of the service, namely the blessing of the already cut bread and its peculiar distribution, certainly again we cannot say that we have here ceremonial precision being handed down. The rubrics for the service of the Artoklasia presuppose the

107. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία . . ."
108. PG 155:620b.

offering of five loaves, in imitation of those five loaves that the Lord blessed in the desert, the elevation and blessing of one of them, and, afterwards, the cutting of all of them as well as their distribution after the end of the service. But we are not able so easily to condemn a most ancient, as it appears, and so pious, but also such a quaint custom. These sometimes preserve the oldest local or even general ecclesiastical traditions, which elsewhere have been forgotten, and were preserved in certain places piously by generations of priests and faithful, and, like their legacy, are found in our hands today. There exist a few such customs, which are opposed to correct ecclesiastical liturgical tradition and practice. We deal with these differently. Here, I do not see the reason that would compel us to be uncompromising and so excessively strict. At another time, an opportunity will be given to us to speak concerning the worth and place of local customs in our worship.

With the requisite tact, one thing could be recommended to the faithful: that five whole loaves are offered and after their blessing that their cutting is done. And this would not be difficult for them to accept, when the beautiful symbolism of the loaves and the relevant practice and teaching of the Lord is explained to them, as it is described in the sacred gospels (Matt 14:13–21, 15:32–39, Mark 6:32–44, 8:1–10, Luke 9:10–17, and John 6:1–59).

## 16

## "Today salvation . . ."[109] or "Arising from the tomb . . ."[110]?

We publish below an important letter of a reverend priest:

"Traditionally and in accordance with the older Typika and our liturgical books, such as the Oktōēchos, at the end of the Matins with the doxology and the trisagion before the Divine Liturgy, our older chanters chanted the troparion, 'Today salvation . . .' in the first, second, third, and fourth tone; but, 'Arising from the tomb…' in the plagal of the first, plagal of the second, grave, and plagal of the

109. "Σήμερον σωτηρία . . ."
110. "Ἀναστὰς ἐκ τοῦ μνήματος."

fourth.[111] Nevertheless, during the last few years, in accordance with the *Church Calendar* officially printed by the Apostolikē Diakonia, the second most beautiful troparion in question, 'Arising from the tomb . . .' was completely eliminated and it is specified that they chant always and only, 'Today salvation . . . .' This elimination is bewildering and distressing for us because 'Arising from the tomb . . .' is encountered nowhere else, as we know, in the sacred services. Accordingly, we request that you respond why this elimination took place and if there is a possibility for you to submit the question in point to the honorable Synodal Committee on the Church Calendar for matters concerning this."

In principle, we think that there exists a small misunderstanding regarding the purpose of the *Church Calendar* that is published annually by the Apostolikē Diakonia. As is repeated nearly every time in the introduction to the *Calendar* itself, its purpose is not the elimination of the Typikon of the Great Church of Christ, but the opposite, it is intended to assist priests and chanters for more faithful and accurate implementation of the latter. Let us employ the latter's wording, "the correction or discarding of the Typikon is not provided for, but the making up for its omissions, by arrangement of the church year, formal regulations, and the conforming of the Kyriakodromion[112] to these things." Its basis is the Typikon of the Church of Constantinople, and it comprises "a kind of synopsis of it." Repeatedly, it is recommended that the clergy study the Typikon of the Great Church directly, to which relevant citations often are made. Besides, no one can doubt how useful and practical is this small Typikon, which catches so many errors and misinterpretations of the great Typikon and unimaginably makes easy the performance of sacred services. Almost all of us are witnesses of mistakes that occur not from an indifference of the priests or chanters, but from

111. The implication is that these resurrectional troparia for Sunday would follow and alternate according to the tones of the week.

112. κυριακοδρόμιον, τό (pl. κυριακοδρόμια, τά). kyriakodromion (pl. kyriakodromia). This term can designate a book containing the cycle of gospel and epistle readings for Sundays and pertinent homilies, or the cycle of Sunday gospel and epistle readings in general.

a bad interpretation of or from a confusion in the use of the Typikon of the Great Church. And just as it is correctly emphasized in the *Calendar-Typikon*,[113] the reform of the calendar, which was confined only to immoveable sections of the liturgical year and left the moveable to be regulated on the basis of the calculation of the date of Pascha, which takes place according to the old Julian Calendar, became a cause of great anomalies not only in the normal order of the feasts, but also in the old system of the cycle of gospel readings, namely of the Kyriakodromion. The old Typikon did not foresee all these things.

So much for the purpose and the usefulness of the *Church Calendar*.

But do not think that the *Calendar* itself, in the name of liturgical uniformity, seeks to abolish old practices, which exist regionally and are observed always or exceptionally, when "the presider might wish."[114] It is not envious of the methodology of the liturgical steamroller, earlier implemented by Rome, which even in its homeland[115] is no longer in fashion nowadays.

We could verify this in official practice, as it is implemented in great temples, where either personally or even by the broadcast of radio stations we can monitor this. Thus, often we hear the "Lord, I have cried out"[116] without the verses "Set a watch, O Lord..."[117] and so forth in the Vespers, and the "God is the Lord . . . ."[118] without verses in the Matins. On the contrary, oftentimes chanted are all the verses of the psalms of lauds, the typika, and the Beatitudes in the Liturgy, and psalms in place of the koinōnikon.

But specifically regarding "Arising from the tomb . . . ," the Typikon does not refer to it because in most temples it has become prevalent that "Today salvation . . ." is only said. Nevertheless, in the monasteries, "Arising from the tomb . . ." is always chanted in

113. *Ἡμερολόγιον-Τυπικὸν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος*. This is translated, *Calendar-Typikon of the Church of Greece*.

114. "ὁ προεστὼς θελήση." See question 302 regarding the "presider."

115. Italy.

116. "Κύριε ἐκέκραξα."

117. "Θοῦ Κύριε . . ."

118. "Θεὸς Κύριος . . ."

the plagal tones. We still hear it quite often in parish temples. But proof that our Church with her *Calendar* is not attempting its elimination is that she included it also in the last official publication of the Hōrologion, which was done by the Apostolikē Diakonia in the year 1963. There, precisely, on page 87, the old rubric is unchanged: "But if it is a Sunday, after the end of the doxology and the trisagion we say resurrection troparia; the present troparion, 'Today salvation . . . ,' in the fourth tone when it is the first, second, third, and fourth tones of the week, but we say the troparion, 'Arising from the tomb . . .' in the plagal of the fourth tone when the tone of the week is in plagal of the first, plagal of the second, grave, and plagal of the fourth." Let us note that there also exists another tradition regarding this point: "Today salvation . . ." is chanted in the first, third, plagal of the first, and grave tone, and "Arising from the tomb . . ." in the second, fourth, plagal of the second, and plagal of fourth tone.

In any case, we published the letter of the reverend parish priest and on behalf of *Ὁ Ἐφημέριος*, we submitted it with our serial column to the cognizant Synodal Committee, with our thought that a pertinent clarification would not be without purpose for at least the alleviation of every possible misunderstanding.[119]

## 17

**Is it an error and sin when the priest offers incense during the time of the great doxology, and if it is, why?**

The offering of incense at the time of the great doxology is not expressly provided for by the Typikon, yet it is traditionally observed by many priests not only during festal, but also during ordinary Liturgies. In order for us to examine whether this practice is correct or not, we will need to make a small retrospection into the old practice and into the present position of the great doxology after the uniting of the Divine Liturgy with the service of Matins.

As is well known, the great doxology is the last part of the service of Matins that is concluded with the troparion, "Today salvation

119. The revisions suggested by Phountoulēs appear to be reflected in the later service books published by the Apostolikē Diakonia, which were preceded by publications from the Holy Mountain.

. . ."[120] or "Arising from the tomb . . ."[121] on Sundays, and with the apolytikion of the feast or of the saint on other days. In parishes, the exclamation "Blessed is the Kingdom . . ."[122] immediately follows nowadays, namely, the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy is proclaimed. Nevertheless, as we also wrote on another occasion, between both of these completely independent services, there exist prescribed diaconal and priestly prayers that conclude the Matins, as well as other preparatory elements for the Divine Liturgy. Thus, from Matins, the final ektenēs, the petitions, the prayer of inclination, and the dismissal have not been said. Again, from the preparatory part of the Divine Liturgy, the Fiftieth Psalm, "O Heavenly King,"[123] "Glory to God in the highest,"[124] "O Lord, open my lips,"[125] and the small dialogue between priest and deacon, if a deacon also takes part in the Divine Liturgy, have not been said. All these elements apart from the Fiftieth Psalm, which is no longer said, have been gathered into those items said inaudibly by the priest during the great doxology, that by reason of its duration and its place was viewed as the most appropriate time for saying "inaudibly"[126] everything the development of the Divine Liturgy prescribed no longer to be said "in an exclamatory manner."[127] Consequently, also, we must turn our in-

120. "Σήμερον σωτηρία..."
121. "Ἀναστὰς ἐκ τοῦ μνήματος."
122. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία..."
123. "Βασιλεῦ οὐράνιε."
124. "Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις."
125. "Κύριε, τὰ χείλη μου ἀνοίξεις."
126. "μυστικῶς."
127. "ἐκφώνως." The term "μυστικῶς" is translated as "inaudibly," and "ἐκφώνως," is translated "in an exclamatory manner." Regarding the meaning of "ἐκφώνως," Phountoulēs states in question 410:

The ἐκφώνησις (exclamation) is the doxological epilogue of every single prayer, which is chanted melodically: ἐκφώνως (in an exclamatory manner). Namely, we can characterize the expression, ἐκφώνως (in an exclamatory manner) as a type of musical term, parallel to the phrase ἐκφωνητικὴ ψαλμῳδία (exclamatory chanting), which denotes the mode of melodious reading of sacred texts. In contrast, the prayer constitutes the main body of the text and is read either "εἰς ἐπήκοον" (within earshot) of the people, according to the more ancient taxis, which still applies even today in the sacred mysteries apart from the Divine Liturgy, or "μυστικῶς" (inaudibly), as became prevalent later in the prayers

quiry to the offering of incense there. We must recognize the latter, if the tradition has a basis, either as an element of the end of Matins or preparatory for the Divine Liturgy. The second occurs in the case of the censing.

Consistent with ancient witnesses, before the Divine Liturgy begins, the priest incenses the altar and the entire temple, and the altar again. Writings that bear the name of Dionysios the Areopagite (*Concerning the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*)[128] and Symeōn of Thessaloniki attest to this. The latter one states that before the Divine Liturgy the priest "incenses both the prothesis itself and the sacred altar in the form of a cross, then the entire sanctuary, showing the first sharing of gifts of grace from God to the saints, and through the saints to the rest...and returns to the altar, since the beginning and end of good things is God, whose throne and place is the altar . . . this represents the grace from heaven, and the gift poured out on the world through Jesus Christ, and the sweet fragrance of the Spirit, which is also carried up again to heaven through the Spirit. And this always occurs for us through Jesus Christ" (*Dialogue*, chapter 96).[129] And again, according to the *Diataxis* of Philotheos of Constantinople,[130] who codifies the early liturgical practice, the deacon after the

---

of the Divine Liturgy and of certain other services, namely of Vespers and Matins.

The "exclamatory chanting" can be compared to the singing used for dialogue and narrative in operas and oratorios. See the explanations of these terms in question 551–553.

128. Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite was a sixth century author who falsely represented his writings as those of the hieromartyr Saint Dionysios, who is mentioned in Acts 17:34 and commemorated on October 3. Pseudo-Dionysios's theological views were heavily influenced by Neoplatonism and exercised a wide influence on liturgical writings (Alexander Kazhdan and Barry Baldwin, "Dionysios the Areopagite, Pseudo-," *ODB* 2:629–630).

129. Translation taken from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, ed. and trans., *St. Symeon of Thessalonika, The Liturgical Commentaries,* vol. 168 of *Studies and Texts* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2011), 237–238.

130. Philotheos Kokkinos (Φιλόθεος Κόκκινος) was a patriarch of Constantinople (r. 1353–1354/1355, 1364–1376) and while abbot of the Great Lavra on Mount Athos authored the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* (*Διάταξις τῆς Θείας Λειτουργίας*) and the *Diataxis of Hierodeaconship* (*Διάταξις περὶ τῆς ἱεροδιακονίας*). Through the work's popularity and influence as a ceremonial, the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* canonized the Athonite rubrics for

dismissal of the proskomidē "chants the 'Have mercy upon me O God' and incenses crosswise the holy table, the holy prothesis, and the whole sanctuary, likewise also the entire temple, beginning from its northerly section."[131] After the censing, there follow three prostrations, "O Heavenly King . . . ," "Glory to God in the highest," and the rest. A remnant of this practice is the censing of the sacred bēma provided for by the Hieratika after the dismissal of the proskomidē, when the troparia are being said: "In the grave bodily . . . ,"[132] "As life-bearing . . . "[133] and "Of the Most High . . . ."[134] The censing here was regarded as connected with the service of the proskomidē rather than with the Divine Liturgy. But the ancient practice was strictly preserved in the sacred monasteries. During the service of the Sixth Hour, to which the Divine Liturgy is attached, the priest censes the sanctuary and the temple. The tradition has been more purely preserved in the Liturgy of the Presanctified, before which incense is offered completely without reference to the proskomidē, at the time that the Beatitudes are chanted, in immediate connection with the Divine Liturgy which follows.

---

the Eucharist that came to govern the present celebration of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy. This discussion is based on Robert Taft, "Mount Athos: A Late Chapter in the History of the Byzantine Rite," *DOP* 42 (1988): 191–194. Phountoulēs used the *Diataxis* as one of the sources for a modern publication of a Hierodiakonikon, *Ἱεροδιακονικόν, περιέχον ἅπασαν τὴν διάταξιν τῆς Ἱεροδιακονίας εἰς τὸν ἑσπερινὸν καὶ τὸν ὄρθρον εἰς τὰς τρεῖς λειτουργίας* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἔκδ. Πανσέληνος, 1989). The text of the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy (Codex Panteleēmonos 6277-770)* is published in Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας*, Texte und Forschungen zur Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Philologie no. 15 (Ἀθῆναι: Ἡ ἐπιστημονικὴ ἐπιτροπὴ πρὸς ἀναθεώρησιν καὶ ἔκδοσιν τῶν λειτουργικῶν βιβλίων, 1935), 1–16. In addition, also while abbot, Philotheos authored the *Diataxis of Hierodeaconship* (*Διάταξις περὶ τῆς ἱεροδιακονίας*), which provides direction on how the deacon serves with a priest in Vespers, Matins, and Liturgy. The text of the *Diataxis* may be found in PG 154:745–766. When referring to the "*Diataxis of Philotheos*," unless otherwise noted, Phountoulēs is referring to the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy*.

131. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 5. This text is not taken from *Codex Panteleēmonos 6277-770* (fourteenth century), but from the *Codex National Library of Athens 8 (under number 662)* from the twelfth–thirteenth centuries.

132. "Ἐν τάφῳ σωματικῶς."

133. "Ὡς ζωηφόρος."

134. "Τὸ τοῦ Ὑψίστου."

Certainly, then, we can conclude that the offering of incense at the time of the great doxology not only is not irregular, but is also completely consistent with the ancient practice, since it precisely preserves the oldest offering of incense before the Divine Liturgy.

## 18

**In the service of betrothal and during the prayer "Lord our God . . . for you created from the beginning male and female and by you is a woman joined to a man . . ."[135] the newlyweds at this point are customarily holding one another by the two small fingers of their right hands. Is this correct and why?**

According to the practice that is generally prevalent nowadays, the union of the right hands or of the small fingers of the right hands of the newlyweds is done by the priest during the service of marriage and particularly at that point of the prayer that is before the crowning, "Holy God, who fashioned humanity from dust...and do you yourself now stretch forth your hand from your holy dwelling place and join together your servant [name] and your servant [name], for by you a woman is joined to a man."[136] According to the manuscripts, this union of hands or fingers does not always take place at the same moment or in the same way. Thus, some record that at this point, "and he entwines their small right fingers,"[137] but others place it after the exclamation of the prayer ("and holding their right hands the priest gives them to one another"[138] or "he joins their right hands"[139]), yet others after the prayer, "Blessed are you O Lord..."[140]

---

135. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . . σὺ γὰρ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐδημιούργησας ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ, καὶ παρὰ σοῦ ἁρμόζεται ἀνδρὶ γυνή . . ."

136. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ πλάσας ἐκ χοὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον . . . αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν, Δέσποτα, ἐξαπόστειλον τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐξ ἁγίου κατοικητηρίου σου, καὶ ἅρμοσον τὸν δοῦλον σου (τόνδε) καὶ τὴν δούλην σου (τήνδε), ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἁρμόζεται ἀνδρὶ γυνή." Translation modified from N.M. Vaporis, ed., John von Holzhausen and Michael Gelsinger, trans., *An Orthodox Prayer Book* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1977), 87.

137. "καὶ συμπλέκει αὐτῶν τοῖς δεξιοῖς ἄκροις δακτύλοις."

138. "καὶ κρατήσας ὁ ἱερεὺς αὐτῶν τὰς δεξιὰς χεῖρας, παραδίδωσιν ἀλλήλοις."

139. "ζευγνύει αὐτῶν τὰς δεξιὰς χεῖρας."

140. "Εὐλογητὸς εἶ Κύριε . . ."

and, finally, others at the end of the service ("and entwining their right hands he says . . .").[141]

However, an analogous joining of hands or fingers is not provided for nowadays for the service of betrothal. Though, still, in many manuscripts, a joining of the hands or fingers of the future spouses follows the placement of the rings. Thus, after the placement of the rings, the priest says, "'The servant of God [name] is joined to the servant of God [name] in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit,' And they give their hands to one another, and he entwines them"[142] or "and so the priest holding their right hands entwines them with one another."[143] This connection of hands was released after the kiss that the betrothed exchanged at the end of the service of betrothal. Nowadays this is not done, yet it appears that in some places this ancient custom has been maintained. I assume that the reason for which it ceased otherwise from taking place owes itself to the custom that later became prevalent for the service of marriage to be attached to the service of betrothal. In that case, in order that the same action not occur twice, the joining of hands was confined and took place only during the service of marriage. We take this opportunity to note that it is necessary for us not to forget that in some places ancient local customs have been preserved in the service of marriage that have their bases in ancient and honorable tradition. And the ones that have been made official in the prevalent present-day practice have their roots in other old local traditions that for one reason or another have had greater diffusion than others.

The meaning of this joining of hands or fingers does not appear particularly difficult. The union of hands is a symbol of the union and communion, in the name of and before the Trinitarian God, of two human beings unrelated up until that moment, who are con-

141. "καὶ πλέξας αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν τὰς δεξιὰς λέγει . . ."

142. "Ἁρμόζεται ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ (δεῖνα) τὴν δούλην τοῦ Θεοῦ (δεῖνα), εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρός, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Καὶ παραδίδωσι τὰς χεῖρας καὶ συνάπτει ἀλλήλους." The Greek word, δεῖνα (so-and-so), is often parenthetically inserted as a placeholder in prayers and petitions where specific name(s) can be inserted. In the present translation, the word "name" has been used to translate this word.

143. "καὶ οὕτω κρατήσας ὁ ἱερεὺς τὰς δεξιὰς συμπλέκει ἀλλήλοις."

senting, when fulfilling God's will, to enter "into a communion of marriage"[144] and a complete physical and spiritual union. Symeōn of Thessaloniki characteristically states that the priest "joins their hands signifying the perfection of the union" (*Dialogue*, chapter 279).[145] And the words of the prayer bring this out: "stretch forth your hand . . . and join together your servant [name] and your servant [name], for by you a woman is joined to a man; join them together in oneness of mind, crown them in one flesh . . . ."[146] Still, in many manuscripts this union is accompanied by certain phrases that clearly show its meaning: "The servant of God [name] is joined to the servant of God [name] in the name of the Father and the Son and of the Holy Spirit,"[147] or "Receive it from the temple,"[148] or "Go in peace,"[149] or "The Lord's right hand has wrought powerfully, the Lord's right hand exalted me."[150] But even without these beautiful words, the symbolic union of hands is so eloquent that it speaks for itself. It is needful only that the priest knows its mystical language and helps the newlyweds to understand its sacred symbolism.

As regard the union of hands in the betrothal, this had precisely the same meaning. The betrothal blessed by the Church with the pertinent service is also a formal promise before God for the future union that the union of hands vividly symbolizes.

144. "εἰς γάμου κοινωνίαν."
145. PG 155:509c.
146. "ἐξαπόστειλον τὴν χεῖρά σου... καὶ ἅρμοσον τὸν δοῦλον σου (τόνδε) καὶ τὴν δούλην σου (τήνδε), ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἁρμόζεται ἀνδρὶ γυνή· σύζευξον αὐτοὺς ἐν ὁμοφροσύνῃ, στεφάνωσον αὐτοὺς εἰς σάρκα μίαν . . ."
147. "Ἁρμόζεται ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ (δεῖνα) τὴν δούλην τοῦ Θεοῦ (δεῖνα), εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρός, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος."
148. "Παράλαβε αὐτὴν ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ."
149. "Πορεύεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ."
150. "Δεξιὰ Κυρίου ἐποίησε δύναμιν, δεξιὰ Κυρίου ὕψωσέ με." Ps 117:16.

## 19

**Why do marriages not take place during the month of May?**

This concerns an age-old idolatrous custom, which, according to the testimony of Plutarch[151] and other writers, was observed by the Romans.[152] It was passed on by them to the Hellenistic world and to Byzantium and has extended up until even our own age. It is connected with the superstition that rests upon the day of the celebration of the marriage, and its future good outcome, if the day was auspicious, but bad if it was inauspicious. We do not know precisely for what reason May was considered by the Romans as an unsuitable month for performances of marriages. By many interpretations that he provides in the present case, Plutarch reveals that neither did the Romans of his epoch know precisely the reason. It appears more likely that the feast of the Lemuria contributed to this, which was celebrated during this month, and which was dedicated to the gods of the underworld and the dead. During Christian times, this tradition continued, and an effort was made for it to be explained by people as due to the feast of Saint Maura (May 3),[153] since her name is reminiscent of mourning and ill fortune, or to the name of this month, which is similar sounding to sorcery (μαγεία), regarding which newlyweds must be particularly fearful, or even to the fall of Constantinople (May 29), although, as we have seen, this custom is nearly a thousand years older than this.

It is not necessary to note that superstitions of any such type are in clear conflict with Christian belief. For the faithful, there do not exist good and bad days or auspicious and inauspicious months that can favorably and unfavorably influence conjugal life. All days and nights belong to the Lord of heaven and earth, who "sends forth the light, and it shines"[154] and who "divided between day and between

151. Mestrius Plutarchus (b. before AD 50, d. after AD 120) was a philosopher and biographer influential in the classical world and Byzantium, (Donald Andrew Frank Moore Russell, "Plutarch," *OCD* 1200–1201).

152. Plutarch, *Quaestiones Romanae* 86; cf. Ovid, *Fasti* v.489.

153. Ἁγία Μαύρα.

154. Bar 3:33, paraphrase.

night,"[155] as Holy Scripture teaches and the prayers of the Church repeat. And Christians are able to enter into marriage according to the will of the Lord on any day whatsoever, not observing "days and months and seasons" (Gal 4:10). The Church's prohibition regarding the performance of marriages during periods of fasting has a completely different purpose and character.

## 20

**Must the sponge be kept in the holy chalice in remembrance of the well-known event, or must this be eliminated and fall into disuse, as some believe?**

There are indeed some priests, who are of the opinion, that the sponge of the holy chalice not only does not serve any practical purpose, inasmuch as the cleansing of the chalice is done with the veils, but on the contrary is a source of uncleanliness and moisture. Motivated by these things, others are proposing its abolition, and some, more daring, have already carried it out. It would be necessary to be emphasized that they act badly, and their arguments are unfounded. If anyone is able to happen upon unclean and moist sponges of holy chalices, the sponges are not at fault for this, but the priests that do not show the necessary attention and care. On the contrary, there are priests, and I hope all of them wish to belong in this category, who maintain the holy vessels in exemplary cleanliness and, with the piety that distinguishes them, after the cleaning and cleansing of the holy chalice, wipe it dry with a special veil, and kiss and place the sponge within it, in order to absorb the traces of moisture that possibly remained, and afterwards cover it with care. They keep the sponge always in sparkling cleanliness, as befits its sacred purpose.

Admittedly, however, the practical aim of the sponge is minor. But this is irrelevant. The sponge was not introduced only for a practical reason, but more to symbolize that sponge where it also played its role in the Lord's Passion on the Cross. This passion is symbolized by the service of the prothesis with the priest's words and actions, with its various liturgical vessels, and the representation of the un-

155. Gen 1:14, paraphrase.

nailing ("extreme humility"), where this was depicted and is still depicted in its apse. Utility and expediency are not always good guides in matters of divine worship. Other factors also exist that have an effect on its formation, that play perhaps a more important role than the prior ones. There are vessels, rites, and liturgical practices that originated from purely symbolic reasons, and others again that with the passage of time lost their ancient practical aim and exist today thanks only to a mystical and symbolic meaning that has been given to them. If they changed or abolished all these things with logic and utility as sole criteria, I do not know what would remain from our divine worship. And let us go no further than the Divine Liturgy: Would a knife be more practical than the lance? Or what is the need for the double veils of the holy gifts? Or what purpose does the small entrance serve? Or why does the priest go to the prothesis when saying "Blessed is he who comes . . ."[156] during the chanting of the trisagion? Or why does the deacon vest with the orarion in the well-known manner and the bishop the great ōmophorion? And a thousand other things. Permit me to say that sometimes our ignorance, strengthened by the decline of our devotion for what has been handed down, makes us much bolder than what is needed.

## 21

**If the priest was called upon to conduct a service and begins with "Blessed"[157] and celebrates the service, must he do a dismissal or is the dismissal unnecessary?**

Each church service has a prescribed schēma. It always begins with a glorification of God, different in each instance ("Blessed is our God . . ."[158] "Glory to the holy and consubstantial . . ."[159] "Blessed is the Kingdom . . ."[160]), and is concluded with a stereotypical "dismissal," "great" or "small," which is sealed with "Through the

156. "Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος . . ."
157. "Εὐλογητός."
158. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός . . ."
159. "Δόξα τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ ὁμοουσίῳ . . ."
160. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία . . ."

prayers . . . ."[161] The enarxis blessing and the dismissal are omitted in some cases when one service is attached to another. Then only the first starts with the blessing of the enarxis and only the last one is concluded with a dismissal. Thus, for example, this is done in the services of Hours, Great or Minor, and in the service of Hagiasmos of Theophany. But this is rather more an exception. In all other cases, even though a service is ending consecutively with another, separate enarxes and separate dismissals are done for each one. For example, the services of the Midnight Office, Matins, and Divine Liturgy, where they are commonly attached but each one has its own enarxis and dismissal (even though the dismissal of Matins occurs silently), the services of the Ninth Hour and Vespers, those of betrothal and marriage, that of the Divine Liturgy and the Vespers of Kneeling of Pentecost, and so forth. In this manner, each service begins with the blessing of God and concludes with the blessing of the faithful present at the service, because naturally this is the dismissal, a blessing that means the end of the sacred service and gives the signal for departure—dismissal—for the faithful. Therefore, I do not think that its omission is permitted or justified.

## 22

**How must the wine of the common cup be given to the newlyweds and what must be done with the remainder, is it all drunk by the newlyweds, poured into the chōneutērion, or consumed by small children?**

And on this point, there did not exist or does not exist a uniform practice in various places. In one place, the priest gave drink three times to the bridegroom and then to the bride. In another place, thrice times three, he gave drink three times, namely, first to the bridegroom, then to the bride, next again to the bridegroom, and so forth. In other places, after the newlyweds, he also gave drink to the best man three times, while in others, it was confined to the newlyweds alone. Nowadays, at least in most places, he gives drink only once three times to the newlyweds and to the best man. The

161. "Δι' εὐχῶν . . ."

symbolism is obvious. The newlyweds for the first time partake of common food and drink from a common cup blessed by the Lord, which signifies the sharing of life's goods and their complete union, or as Symeōn of Thessaloniki states, "for a sign of the union in the joy from God, and that the joy will come to them from peace and concord" or "in a partial blessing, good communion, and union by a blessing of God" (*Dialogue*, chapter 282).[162] The best man again like a witness, a "friend of the bridegroom," and a person, who was often responsible for the contracting of the marital bond, also himself participated symbolically in the joy and communion of the newlyweds' good things.

The bridegroom consumed the remainder of the cup, or the best man or someone among those present or small children, or it was poured into the chōneutērion or into the ground, or the cup was shattered by the priest and together with its contents was also scattered. Various old manuscripts testify to these things. Nowadays various customs prevail locally. All are founded upon a certain reason or have a history. The consumption by the bridegroom or the best man or by someone among those present or by small children, just as also the pouring into the chōneutērion, took place in order that the desecration of the wine blessed by a "spiritual blessing" would be avoided. Particularly, the consumption by small children was a remembrance of an old practice, according to which innocent children assisted the priest in the consumption of the remainder of the Holy Eucharist, which at that time was abundant because the consecration was not limited, as today, to small quantities.[163] Again, the shattering of the cup and the scattering of its contents on the ground were symbolic of the fragile human happiness that will be shared for the newlyweds and would have a common end for them. Moreover, the pouring of the wine on the ground signified the surplus of the newlyweds' happiness that would overflow and would spread among those around them.

And what we wrote in response to question number eighteen applies regarding local customs. Through their observance, the priest

162. PG 155:513a.

163. See questions 460–461.

should direct his attention chiefly to one thing: to the safeguarding of the sacredness of the blessed wine from every desecration that would be due either to the negligence or to the indifference of those present, or to the various popular superstitions that have become associated through satanic influence or out of superstition with certain sacred rites of our Church. Thus, for the case in point, he should not leave the remainder of the cup to the disposal, in particular, of unmarried young women, promoting or tolerating their superstition in this manner, that, if they drink of it, they will hasten the time of their own marriage.

## 23

**In the prayer of the Cherubic hymn "No one is worthy . . . ,"[164] among other things, we also read the following: ". . . but deem worthy that these gifts be offered to you by me, your sinful and unworthy servant . . . ."[165] My question is not on the word "gifts,"[166] but on the word "these,"[167] which as a demonstrative pronoun presupposes also the existence of the precious gifts on the holy table, a thing which has not yet taken place. What position, then, does the word "these" have here?**

The observation is very correct. The demonstrative pronoun "these" since it is spoken by the priest who finds himself before the holy table presupposes that the gifts are located upon it and not in the holy prothesis. He could say in a different way "those gifts" or merely "the gifts." However, we all know that this signifies precisely the opposite; the gifts are found in the prothesis and not on the holy table, where they will be transferred in a short time during the great entrance. Indeed, we find ourselves in the face of a contradiction. We could, perhaps, justify it saying that the author of the prayer speaks generally concerning the gifts that are going to be brought in a short time to the holy table, without him being precise, when referring

164. "Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος."
165. "ἀλλ' ἀξίωσον προσενεχθῆναί σοι ὑπ' ἐμοῦ τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ καὶ ἀναξίου δούλου σου τὰ δῶρα ταῦτα."
166. "δῶρα."
167. "ταῦτα."

to an action that is going to occur as having already taken place. But the author of the prayer is not random. The prayer, "No one is worthy . . . ," is one of the most beautiful prayers of our Eucho-logia, with a power of inspiration, elevated meaning, and masterful expression. Therefore, it would be difficult for us to attribute such a contradiction to the writing quill of its author.

Our inquiry must be oriented in another direction. Although also found today in the two Byzantine Liturgies of Basileios the Great and Chysostomos, this prayer does not appear to have belonged originally to either one. At least, this is what some very old manuscripts reveal. However, it is found in the Alexandrian Liturgy of Saint Grēgorios. It appears that it belonged originally to it, because, if we notice, it is addressed to Christ, as also all the prayers of that Liturgy, while the prayers of the Byzantine Liturgies, apart also from three others ("Hearken, O Lord . . . "[168] and "You who yourself are the fulfillment of the law . . ."[169] of the Liturgy of Chrysostomos and "The mystery of your dispensation, O Christ our God, has been accomplished and perfected . . ."[170] of the Liturgy of Basileios), all are addressed to God the Father. In this Liturgy of Saint Grēgorios, this prayer was said as "a prayer of the curtain"[171] with the placing of the precious gifts on the holy table. Thus, the phrase "these gifts" is completely justified. When this prayer was introduced into the Byzantine Liturgies, it had the location in which it is found now, and the text as it was in the Liturgy of Grēgorios was preserved without anyone noticing (up until today—at least as far as I know—apart from the priest who submitted the question) the difficulty that the phrase "these gifts" presents. But so also a new point is added on the subject of the origins of the prayer from the Liturgy of Saint Grēgorios, which again no one had noticed.

---

168. "Πρόσχες Κύριε . . ."
169. "Τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ νόμου . . ."
170. "Ἥνυσται καὶ τετέλεσται . . ."
171. "εὐχὴ τοῦ καταπετάσματος." For an edition of this Liturgy and the prayer, see Ἱερὰ Μητρόπολις Θεσσαλονίκης, *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Πατρὸς ἡμῶν Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωσταντινουπόλεως* (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 1981), 8–10.

## 24

**What color vestments must the priest wear and what color veils must the holy prothesis and holy table be covered with during the performance of the mysteries of the Orthodox Church, as well as during the period of the Great Lent and the remaining feasts of the year and during the performance of funeral or memorial services?**

It should be emphasized from the beginning that color has its purpose in divine worship. Its harmony assists the one attending to concentrate better and to devote himself/herself to the celebration of the mystery, while the absence of harmony disrupts attention and does not give rise in the soul of the impression of the heavenly order that is depicted in divine worship. The influence that certain colors exercise on the spiritual disposition of human beings is confirmed by psychology. The modest and aesthetically beautiful colors evoke analogous sentiments. In addition, every color also conceals a symbolism, not only in divine worship, but even in everyday life. Does not black signify mourning and contrition? Does not white, joy and innocence? Is not red the color that reminds one of blood and sacrifice? The Church ought to use all these so that the purpose of the sacred service might be better achieved. All the senses—sight, hearing, smell, touch, and even taste—are working together for the glorification of God and the purification of humanity.

The question of the color of vestments has not been studied historically and we do not know whether there existed relevant traditions and what these were during the Byzantine era.[172] Nor again, whether there existed a single tradition or if various customs were prevalent according to location. Only by rare witnesses among ecclesiastical writers and witnesses of liturgical manuscripts are we able to reach some conclusions. However, as much as it seems that there did not so much exist strict rules that determined the color of vestments, as subsequently in the West, the more so it appears that there

172. Since this writing, there have been such studies, for example, see Warren T. Woodfin, *The Embodied Icon, Liturgical Vestments and Sacramental Power in Byzantium* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

existed a relevant tradition of colors. Thus, during the performance of baptism, the bishop or the priests wore white vestments. Again, during the Lenten period, they wore vestments with dark colors. In addition, certain vestments had a fixed color such as the sticharion of the deacons, which was white, the sticharion of bishops, which was red or white with reddish streams, and so forth.

In the Western Church, there exist standard rubrics that precisely prescribe the colors of the priest's vestments commensurate with the symbolism of each color that is associated with the character of each feast. In this way, they wear white vestments on the feasts of Christ, the Theotokos, and the saints who are not martyrs, red on feasts of the Lord's passion, the Holy Spirit, the apostles, and the martyrs, green on Sundays before Christmas and after the feast of Lights, purple during fasts and processions, and black during Great Lent, funerals, and memorial services.

In our own Church,[173] set rules do not presently exist that prescribe the color of vestments. On this point, one could perhaps say that a disorder distinguishes us that is accentuated in concelebrations, during which each priest wears whatever color he likes. In this way, you become witnesses of often quite fantastic, variegated colors, without any scheme or without a trace of harmony. The vestments of the holy table one color, the prothesis another one, the veils of the precious gifts a different one, the vestments of the hierarch another one, the vestments of every priest different from each other, and another one for the deacons. Let's just say that many times even the priestly vestment is composed of a mosaic of shades and colors. Certainly, financial reasons would be put forward that prevent our priests from having many vestments of different colors, and force them to vest themselves, especially in poor areas, any which way. Without anyone wishing to ignore the legitimacy of this objection, it can be admitted that oftentimes we are guilty of neglect, even of inattention, rather than victims of our poverty. The inheritance of slavery also weighs upon us, whose traces still remain in many manifestations of our

173. The Church of Greece.

divine worship.[174] Certainly, we ought to admit that the situation has somewhat improved. Especially in large temples, an effort by many priests and deacons is taking place for there to be many uniform priest and deacon vestments that are in harmony with the veils of the holy table, and new priests are avoiding variegated colors and arranging their vestments with better taste than the old-timers.

Despite all these things, even nowadays a pertinent tradition exists that prescribes the color of vestments and that apparently has its roots in the old practice of our Church. For example, during the performance of baptism, the old practice is preserved for the most part and many priests dress with white vestments. White again is prevalent also during the period of Pascha, while dark colors are used on weekdays of Lent in all places. Priests wear white or likewise black epitrachēlia and phelōnia during funeral services, consistent with local tradition and the age of the one being buried. On the Holy Mountain, where the ancient traditions are preserved with great piety, the priests wear white during the reading of the Resurrection eōthinon gospel of Sundays and red during feasts of the Mother of God. During the period of the Great Lent and Pascha, the vesting of the holy table and veils of the sacred prothesis follow the colors of the vestments of the priests, namely they are correspondingly black or white.

For all the other great feasts and the other periods of the liturgical year, there does not exist a tradition that prescribes the color of vestments. Neither does the color of the sanctuary's vestments change during the performance of mysteries nor other services. The priests alone wear bright or mournful vestments consistent with the circumstances. The same thing also applies to the performance of funeral or memorial services. The temple and the sanctuary must never be decorated with mournful colors, no matter how important the deceased was in the world. Such distinctions must not take place within the Christian temple, not only because this is antithetical to the evangelical spirit of equality, but also because exaggerated mourning is inconsistent with the meaning that Christianity gives

174. Namely, the Ottoman rule of Greece.

to death, which it views as "sleep,"[175] "a departure,"[176] and "a transformation from things most sorrowful unto things most good and most sweet, and rest and joy"[177] (prayer of Kneeling of Pentecost). Those who are mourning come to draw consolation and hope from the Church and not mourning and despair.

## 25

**When must the crowns be removed from the newlyweds, at the end of the kiss or at the prayer, "O God, our God . . . receive their crowns . . ."[178]?**

On this point, there does not exist, but neither does it appear that even earlier there ever existed, a uniform practice. In some places, the crowns "are removed"[179] at the prayer, "O God, our God," in others at the end of the service after the dismissal, and in others after the newlyweds' procession to the home. This is owed mainly to a practical reason, namely, to the position that is assigned to the kiss in each locale, in accordance with the particular custom that is prevalent in it. And I will explain.

The regular position of the kiss is found precisely after the sacred dance that is accompanied by the known troparia, "Isaiah dance . . ."[180] and so forth. The two small prayers that follow, "Be magnified, O bridegroom as Abraham . . ."[181] and "And you, O Bride, be magnified as was Sarah . . . ,"[182] which are said by the priest while he touches or holds up the crowns, are the first prayers that the newlyweds receive after their marriage, which by rights belong to the priest that performed the mystery. At this point, the prayers and kisses of those present follow. First, the parents would come and pray, according to the manuscripts, "'God grant you, our children, from the

175. "κοίμησιν."
176. "ἔξοδο."
177. "μετάστασιν ἐκ τῶν λυπηροτέρων ἐπὶ τὰ χρηστότερα καὶ θυμηδέστερα καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ χαράν."
178. "Ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . . ἀνάλαβε τοὺς στεφάνους αὐτῶν..."
179. "αἴρονται."
180. "Ἠσαΐα χόρευε . . ."
181. "Μεγαλύνθητι, Νυμφίε, ὡς ὁ Ἀβραάμ . . ."
182. "Καὶ σύ, Νύμφη, μεγαλύνθητι ὡς ἡ Σάῤῥα . . ."

dew of heaven and from the prosperity of the earth . . .'[183] and they kissed them and the crowns." The attendants then came forward, while the choirs chanted the first theotokia of the eighth tone. In a procession afterwards, they went to the house, always wearing the crowns, and there the prayer was read, "O God, our God . . . ," and the dismissal took place. This prayer is described by the codices as, "a prayer for the bridal chamber,"[184] or "for the loosening of the crowns,"[185] or "for the taking up of the crowns,"[186] or "for the lifting up of the crowns,"[187] or "for the lifting up of the crowns from the heads of the newlyweds,"[188] or "a nuptial prayer while raising the crowns,"[189] or more simply, "a prayer of uncrowning."[190] The title clearly indicates the liturgical aim of the prayer that is also suggested by its phrase, "receive their crowns in your kingdom,"[191] which is accompanied in some manuscripts by the note, "he removes the crowns from their heads" or "then he takes the crowns." This was the original and correct location of the kiss and the uncrowning, which is still maintained in certain places, especially in villages. The differences that arose later are owed to the difficulties that the observance of this Typikon caused especially in large cities. Thus, the original practice was preserved faithfully, but the removal of the crowns with the pertinent prayer and the dismissal followed immediately after the kiss, irrespective of whether or not the transition to the house took place in procession. Again, in other places, the lifting up of the crowns is normally done in its original location, but the kiss, for reasons of order was transferred to the end of the service. Finally, in other places, they did not remove the crowns at the prayer of the uncrowning, but at the end after the kiss, so that those attending could kiss the crowns.

183. "Δώη σας ὁ Θεός, τέκνα ἡμῶν, ἀπὸ τῆς δρόσου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς πιότητος τῆς γῆς . . ."
184. "Εὐχὴ εἰς τὸν παστόν."
185. "εἰς τὸ λύσαι τὰ στέφανα."
186. "εἰς τὸ ἀναλαβεῖν τὰ στέφανα."
187. "εἰς τὸ ἐπᾶραι τὰ στεφάνια."
188. "εἰς τὸ ἐπᾶραι τὰ στέφανα ἀπὸ τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν νεονύμφων."
189. "εὐχὴ ἐπιθαλάμιος ἐν τῷ αἴρειν τοὺς στεφάνους."
190. "εὐχὴ τοῦ ἀποστεφανώματος."
191. "ἀνάλαβε τοὺς στεφάνους αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ Βασιλείᾳ σου."

Which now is the most correct practice? Certainly, the first and original one, which nevertheless has the drawback that under the circumstances that marriages take place nowadays, so much disorder and irregularity intervenes that—despite the continuous chanting—the service is nearly interrupted, and the entire rite nearly loses its sacredness and solemnity. Otherwise, this has also resulted in various efforts for the discovery as much as possible of a lesser evil solution. Namely, we also have here something parallel to the distribution of palms or flowers during the feasts of the Cross, the bread of the Artoklasia, the anointing during unction, and the very imparting of holy communion.

When the ancient practice is observed in the priest's locale, let him preserve it while attempting to instill in those coming forward for the kiss: the respect, the discipline, and the reverence for the mystery being performed and for the sacred place in which it is performed. Again, if the marriage takes place in such an atmosphere where it has more or less these circumstances ensured or if the priest succeeds in creating them with his systematic spiritual work, then let him follow the exact old practice. Again, if this is not possible, let him follow the tradition that he found in his parish, implementing also here a permitted oikonomia.

## 26

**At how many and which points of the sacred service is it right that the bell sounds and why?**

In principle, the bell's ringing has an alerting nature. Namely, it is a sign of a service's enarxis and a way of calling the faithful to it. In manuscripts of the Typika, we find directions for the ringing of the bells consistent with the feast. Thus, in addition also to other things, they prescribe: "when one must give a signal by bells," in how many "stops,"[192] and with how many bells. By the stroke of the bells the faithful were able to understand the level of importance of every feast and the time of the service's enarxis, and to plan their church attendance commensurately, in an age indeed where calendars and

192. στάσεις."

clocks were not in everyone's possession.[193] Nevertheless, it is done somewhat irregularly and not well-planned, even up until nowadays. In contrast, in the monasteries, there were sēmantra and bells of many types, and the time of their ringing—sufficiently complex otherwise—is precisely prescribed by the individual Typika of every single monastery.

In parish temples, which is the question here, the bell rings as we said at the outset, just before every service begins in order that the faithful are respectively alerted. Namely, it rings before Vespers, Matins, and the Divine Liturgy. When one service is attached to another, again the bell rings at the end of the previous one. For example, at the end of the Hours in order for Vespers with the Presanctified to begin; at the end of the Great Hours so that the service of Vespers and the Liturgy of Basileios the Great begin on the eves of the Nativity and of Theophany; or of the Great Vespers of Great Friday; at the end of the Liturgy for the upcoming enarxis of the Service of Kneeling of Pentecost; or of the Great Hagiasmos; or of the Doxology of the National Holiday;[194] and so forth. Thus, the faithful are informed concerning the upcoming enarxis of the service and are called to come to it.

The ringing of the bell presents a difficulty only during the service of Matins, where it takes place connected with the Divine Liturgy. As we know in this latter instance, the bell chimes three times, namely at the beginning of Matins, at the katabasies, and at the doxology. This does not become an issue regarding the beginning of Matins. Regarding the doxology, we will again remember what we wrote in answer to question seventeen, namely, the ringing of bells at the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy, which is precisely done before it just as the offering of incense, the enunciation of "O Heavenly King,"[195] and so forth. Why has it now come to be established that the bell rings also during the katabasies? Perhaps in order to give

193. This system of ringing to notify the faithful of services remains common in Greek village life.

194. The term "National Holiday" here refers to the celebration of the Greek revolution and independence from the Ottoman Empire on March 25.

195. "Βασιλεῦ οὐράνιε."

an additional notification to the faithful concerning the upcoming enarxis of the Divine Liturgy. Perhaps in order that the sacred number of three bell ringings is completed. But perhaps it is due also to the influence of the hierarchical Liturgy. As we know, at this time, the entrance of the hierarch into the temple takes place in order that he might officiate at the Matins and subsequently celebrate the Divine Liturgy, and his arrival is greeted with the ringing of bells.

However, outside of this practical purpose for the call of the faithful, the bells are rung either to express the Church's joy or its sadness, or to accompany sacred processions with joyful or mournful tones. In the first instance we must include the joyful ringing of all the bells at the time of the service of the Resurrection during the chanting of "Christ is risen,"[196] where again however it can be connected with the enarxis of the service of Paschal Matins; in the second, the mournful tolling of the bells during Great Friday and funeral services; and, finally, in the last instance, the bell ringings during the procession of icons during the feasts of temples or of the epitaphios during the service of Matins of Great Saturday.

## 27

**On what day and time does the nailing and unnailing take place of the icon of Christ from the cross?**

The rite of the unnailing was handed down to our regions[197] by the Church of Antioch, where it was introduced very early. Namely, there during the recital, in the style of the gospel reading, of the first troparion of the fifteenth antiphon ("Today is hung on a tree . . ."[198]) of the service of the Holy Passions, namely of the Matins of Great Friday, a cross of large dimensions, upon which the body of Christ was nailed, was carried in procession by the priest, so that its unnailing would be possible. It was set up in the middle of the temple and, there, it remained during the chanting of the aposticha of Great Friday Vespers. During this Vespers, the unnailing took place in the following manner: The epitaphios, as customary, was carried in procession and

196. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη . . ."
197. Greece.
198. "Σήμερον κρεμᾶται ἐπὶ ξύλου . . ."

placed into the koubouklion; next, the icon of the dead Christ was detached from the cross and also itself was put on top of the epitaphios in the koubouklion, which was covered with veils and flowers, and the Gospel book was placed in the center. This service of the unnailing was unknown to the rest of the Orthodox Church. During "Today is hung on a tree . . . ," the icon of the Crucifixion was carried in procession and placed in the proskynētarion, but during the aposticha of Vespers the entrance of the epitaphios took place and its placement into the koubouklion or on a simple table occurred, without the unnailing taking place before. This is precisely observed nowadays on the Holy Mountain and in the Slavic Orthodox churches.

Almost one hundred years ago, during the middle of the past century, at the Patriarchate of Constantinople, they desired to imitate the practice of Antioch, which so graphically portrayed the relevant events of the Christ's passion. The rite became so popular among the clergy and people that it rapidly spread first to the large cities and slowly also to villages and, even, to many monasteries. However, it was slightly modified. Namely, the large cross with the dead body of the crucified Christ nailed upon it is brought in, its entrance takes place during "Today is hung from a tree . . . ," but the unnailing in order to be more graphic is done by the priest at the time that the deacon reads the last phrases of the great gospel of the Great Friday Vespers (". . . now when it was evening, there came a rich man from Arimathea named Joseph . . .and taking the body of Jesus he wrapped it in a pure linen . . .")[199] or, if the priest celebrates the service alone, immediately after the reading of the gospel, in silence or when chanting the kathisma, "In a clean linen, and with divine spices . . . ,"[200] he lays the body on the holy table, but not in the koubouklion for purely technical reasons (in Antioch, the hands of the body of Christ are constructed in a certain way that they can be folded downwards). However, in some places, this practice has still not become prevalent and an unnailing does not occur, but during the reading of the gospel, or immediately after, the cross together with the crucified Christ is covered and taken back into the holy

199. Matt 27:57–59.

200. "Σινδόνι καθαρᾷ καὶ ἀρώμασι θείοις . . ."

bēma, when it is directly painted on the cross or its detachment is not possible from it. Notice with how much difficulty new customs enter into liturgical practice no matter how beautiful and much beloved they are by the people.

The icon of the crucified Christ that was detached during the unnailing from the cross remains in the holy bēma wrapped in a linen throughout the resurrection period, until the leavetaking of Pascha, namely, until the Vespers of the Thursday of the Ascension, when it is attached and again also occupies its customary place behind the holy table or at the base of the apse, while the epitaphios, which (from the end of the service of Matins of Great Saturday, according to our own practice, or from the end of the Midnight Office of the all-night vigil of Pascha, according to the practice of the Slavic churches) was found stretched upon the holy table, is removed from it in order to be placed in its standard position.

## 28

**Why during Great Friday must the body of Christ be placed inside the koubouklion with the head to the north and not to the east, as is the custom of certain priests?**[201]

During the service of Vespers of Great Friday, in all places, both in the sacred monasteries and parish temples of all Orthodox Churches, the epitaphios is placed in such a manner so that the head of the dead Christ that is portrayed on the epitaphios is found towards the north. However, I believe that there does not exist any explanation for this position that is given to the body of Christ. Thus, the worship of the faithful is simply made easier and the epitaphios is better viewed by those attending. In the same manner, all the icons on the proskynētaria are exposed for veneration. Still even the sacred Gospel book, which is placed within the koubouklion on top of the epitaphios, follows the accustomed manner, namely, with the top side facing towards the east, as always, and not towards the west, as it should be if its position was in the manner of the burial of the dead.

201. Among others, see questions 207, 227, and 357 regarding the epitaphios.

If there existed any such association it should be observed at least in the manner of the position of the Gospel book, which even before the epitaphios was introduced, when wrapped in an aēr, as the body of Christ in the linen, was brought in procession during the chanting of the aposticha, resting sideways on the shoulders and head of the priest, and set out for veneration in the center of the temple. And nowadays certainly during the entrance of the epitaphios, the priest also holds the Gospel book and, in some manner, also "buries" it, but the center of gravity has been shifted to the epitaphios.

I do not know if the priests that you mention picked up this way of turning the epitaphios eastwardly with the direction from east to west from older sources or if the same ones judged this way more correct. In any case, whether one or the other came about, this change of orientation would be for the burial of Christ to resemble also in this way the burial of the faithful. Nevertheless, it appears that this is an innovation. The traditional way of the epitaphios's placement is the common one, namely, with the head of Christ towards the north. Besides, the antiminsion is also stretched on the holy table in the same manner during the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, and the epitaphios, during the period of Pascha.

## 29

**Is it correct that the prayer for the woman in childbed is read on the third day, while the prayers clearly reference the first day? Some completely omit reading the prayer for the woman in childbed. Are they doing well?**

## 30

**In certain villages it was prevalent when a woman gave birth and, certainly on the first day, for someone to take a jug of water to the church for the priest to read a prayer so that the ones participating in the birth might wash themselves. Nevertheless, our Euchologion tells us that the priest ought to go to the house of the woman on the first day of the birth and ought to read the prayers over her. However, which of the ones mentioned is correct?**

Both these questions are referring to a common subject, namely, to the small service "for a woman in childbed,"[202] which exists in our Euchologia.

According to the explicit rubric that prefaces this service, it must be read "on the first day after the birth of the child."[203] Moreover, the contents of the prayers also agree with this, which all mention the birth of the child that took place on the same day ("your servant who gave birth today . . . from today until her last breath,"[204] first prayer, "to the one who gave birth today,"[205] third prayer). This then is also the correct practice.

It is read in the home of the woman in her presence and of the other individuals who were present during the childbirth. This is especially apparent in the third prayer where there are references also concerning the house where "the child was born,"[206] and concerning "the ones who touched"[207] the woman in childbed and concerning those who are found "here."[208] In manuscripts apart from these prayers, there exist also others that are called "for women who are found at the hour of birth,"[209] or "for women who happen to be in childbed"[210] or also "for the midwife."[211] However, it appears that the priest in some places did not read the prayers in the home, but outside "before the porch"[212] and after the reading of the prayers he entered the house, censed and sprinkled the entire home or its four corners with hagiasmos, but also anointed the face of the child with the sanctified water.

---

202. "εἰς γυναίκα λεχώ."
203. "τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς γεννήσεως τοῦ παιδίου."
204. "τὴν παροῦσαν, τὴν σήμερον τέξασαν δούλην σου . . . ἀπὸ τῆς σήμερον μέχρι τῆς ἐσχάτης αὐτῆς τελειώσεως."
205. "τῇ τεξάσῃ σήμερον."
206. "ἐγεννήθη τὸ παιδίον."
207. "ἁψαμένοις."
208. "ἐνθάδε."
209. "εἰς τὰς εὑρεθείσας γυναῖκας τῇ ὥρᾳ τῆς γεννήσεως."
210. "εἰς τὰς παρατυχούσας γυναῖκας εἰς λεχώ."
211. "εἰς τὴν μαίαν."
212. "πρὸ τοῦ πυλῶνος."

What now is this "sanctified water,"[213] concerning which our contemporary Euchologia do not discuss, but the use of which in practice was maintained in many places? In one of the codices, it is explicitly stated that it is the "water of the holy Theophany." In another, it is noted that the priest uses "the holy water, namely, of the zeon" for sprinkling. In others again, either it is implied or clearly appears that during the reading of the prayers "a vessel on top of a stool" was placed before the priest, and this water, without a particular sanctification service, was considered in some manner sanctified by the prayers that the priest read. Symeōn of Thessaloniki states that the priest "seals water by the sign of the cross in a prelude of holy baptism" and with it "sprinkles the house, seals also the baby on the forehead for the mind, on the mouth for the word and breath, and on the heart for the life force, so as to remain safeguarded for salvific baptism" (*Dialogue*, chapter 59).[214]

No one can know whether this custom of the priest's not going on-site but sending of sanctified water has a connection with these witnesses of the codices—according to which the service was read outside of the house—or if it is either a different, though related practice, or if it might be a development of the practice that we discussed. In any case, it is a fact that the reading of these prayers presents many difficulties both due to the particular conditions that prevail after childbirth in a home, which do not facilitate the priest's admittance to it, and due to the change of living conditions, particularly in cities, where birth does not often take place in homes, but in special clinics or in hospitals. Indeed, perhaps to this is owed the omission of the service by some priests or its reading on the third day after the birth. In any case, we should note that these prayers are quite late and are not found in any old manuscript, except in manuscripts written after the fourteenth century and again not in all. And in those which exist, they are neither all the same nor are they always three, as in printed Euchologia. Even the contents of the prayers indicate their later origin because many overly ascetical ideas dominate them (for example, see the phrases "in iniquities were we

213. "ἡγιασμένον ὕδωρ."
214. PG 155:208d–209a.

conceived,"[215] first prayer, "have mercy and pardon her faults both voluntary and involuntary,"[216] second prayer, "you who know the weakness of human nature, pardon your servant [name], who has given birth this day, according to the multitude of your compassions . . . see the weakness of us who are condemned and pardon your servant [name] and all the household . . . as a good God and the lover of humankind, for you alone have the authority to forgive sins,"[217] third prayer) or show influences from ancient teachings of the Old Testament concerning the impurity of the woman who has just given birth (see, "and we are in a state of uncleanness before you,"[218] first prayer, "purify her from the state of uncleanness . . . cleanse her from bodily uncleanness,"[219] second prayer, "and all who have touched her and all who happen to be here present . . . forgive,"[220] third prayer. In addition, the anointing by sanctified water and the sprinkling have the meaning of purification). But one could not seriously argue that those who omit the reading of these prayers follow the liturgical tradition before the fourteenth century.

However, whatever the history of the service may be, nowadays it is a fact that this is found in the Euchologion and these prayers, which are included for the same day of birth, must be said according to its rubric. Moreover, they have so much rich content, despite the above two points, concerning which no one could possibly have an objection. The blessing of the woman in childbed and the child, of the house and those present, their protection and their recovery, is requested. From the first moment of his/her birth, the Church welcomes with these her prayers the new human being that came into

---

215. "ἐν ἀνομίαις συνελήφθημεν."

216. "ἐλέησον καὶ συγχώρησον τὰ ἑκούσια καὶ τὰ ἀκούσια αὐτῆς πταίσματα."

217. "ὁ γινώσκων τὸ ἀσθενὲς τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως, συγχώρησον τῇ δούλῃ σου (τῇδε), τῇ τεξάσῃ σήμερον, κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν σου... ἴδε τὴν ἀσθένειαν ἡμῶν τῶν καταδίκων, καὶ συγχώρησον τῇ δούλῃ σου (τῇδε), καὶ παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ . . . ὡς ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος Θεὸς συγχώρησον· ὅτι μόνος ἔχεις ἐξουσίαν ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας."

218. "καὶ διὰ ῥύπου πάντες ἐσμὲν ἐνώπιόν σου."

219. "καὶ τοῦ ῥύπου κάθαρον . . . καὶ καθάρισον αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σωματικοῦ ῥύπου."

220. "καὶ τοῖς ἁψαμένοις αὐτῆς, καὶ τοῖς ἐνθάδε εὑρισκομένοις πᾶσιν . . . συγχώρησον."

this world and sanctifies his/her entrance into it. She will give him/her a name on the eighth day, receive him/her into the temple on the fortieth, catechize him/her, baptize him/her, nourish him/her with the Flesh and Blood of God, crown him/her, be near in his/her spiritual and bodily illnesses, and, when he/she is preparing to depart from this world, she will rush again near him/her and will consign his/her body to the grave with prayers and hymns. But even still dead, she will not forget him/her, but again she will perform supplications and Liturgies until the end of ages for the repose of his/her soul. The Church is truly the loving mother that receives the human being from the moment of his/her birth and guides him/her until the gates of heaven.

## 31

**On the day of Theophany do we pour the Great Hagiasmos, which we keep in the church, in with the newly consecrated water and so renew it, or do we use it up on the eve of the feast of Lights when we sanctify the houses of the faithful?**

Both ways are equally good and, as I am able to acknowledge, both are also practiced by many priests. The second is not at odds also with the letter of the service of the Great Hagiasmos, since this is meant "for blessing of houses." Again, other priests consume the hagiasmos from the previous year or replenish the holy water font[221] with new hagiasmos, without emptying its old contents in any manner whatsoever. A relevant rubric or firm tradition does not exist on the point in question.

## 32

**Many Christians call upon the priest of the parish to exchange the betrothal rings of their children and so forth. What is his stance on the point in question; must he go or not?**

Nowadays, betrothal has an entirely familial and informal character. Ecclesiastically, the future spouses are not viewed as betrothed except only after the performance of the service of betrothal, which,

221. "ἡ φιάλη."

as we all know, presently is celebrated connected with the service of crowning. For this reason, also, the rings are given to the priest before the service and are placed on top of the Gospel book, formerly on the top of the holy table, so that afterwards they are put on the fingers of the betrothed by the priest, as by Christ himself who is represented with the Gospel, and in the "name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit."

Consequently, the presence of the priest and the exchange of the rings by him during the family celebration of betrothal cannot have a character of a benediction[222] of the engagement since the relevant service is not performed. Moreover, for many reasons, it is expressly forbidden and the priest who does not celebrate it in conjunction with marriage is certainly punished. Nevertheless, he could exchange the rings with a prayer or blessing or a troparion. The priest must indeed not only encourage this custom, but also seek to be present at these family celebrations, bringing in this way God's blessing into the homes of his parish and giving a sacred tone to their familial happiness. Thus, a wonderful opportunity of becoming acquainted with the faithful is given to him as well as opening up another means of pastoral activity. The work of a priest is not only liturgical, but also pastoral. And the sanctification of the faithful through the mysteries and sacred rites is, from one viewpoint, an expression of his pastoral activity.

## 33

**At the end of the mystery of marriage, many priests customarily pass the Holy Gospel book in between the newlyweds and separate their hands. Is this prescribed?**

In many places, this liturgical custom is prevalent that the right hands or the entwined small fingers of the right hands of the newlyweds—previously joined by him at the phrase "join together your servant [name] and your servant [name]"[223] of the prayer "Holy God, who fashioned humanity from dust . . ."[224]— are unbound by the priest

222. "ἱερολογία."
223. "ἅρμοσον τὸν δοῦλον σου (τόνδε) καὶ τὴν δούλην σου (τήνδε)."
224. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ πλάσας ἐκ χοὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον . . ."

with the sacred Gospel book after the dismissal of the service of marriage. The symbolism is beautiful and clear. Christ, who through the priest joined the hands of the newlyweds now again separates them while remaining between them and joining both human beings "who are united"[225] in a sacred and unbreakable bond according to His will. It would be difficult for a more graphic way to be found for this to be portrayed than that with which the phrase "union in Christ"[226] expresses with words.

The separation of the hands by the sacred Gospel book itself is not attested to by at least the known manuscripts. On the contrary, at this point, several of them have something completely different. Thus, one notes that after the dismissal, "the priest gives their right hands to one another," and a different one, "entwining their right hands he says, 'Go in peace.'" Namely, there took place at that time the formal handing over, as it were, of the bride to the bridegroom by the priest in order that the procession might leave for the house of the newlyweds. The separation by the Gospel book must be connected rather with the loosening of the crowns, to which it is also parallel. Certainly, it would have taken place originally at the home after the transit in procession there. At the time where the crowns "were taken up"[227] from the heads of the newlyweds, their hands that were joined during the mystery were separated in this beautiful manner. Wherever it is prevalent, it would be good for this custom to continue to be observed while being aware of the beautiful symbolism that it conceals.

## 34

**On various occasions, such as betrothals, weddings, and so forth, many request from the priest the zōnē of the sacred vestments in order that their livelihoods, as they say, may go well. What must we know regarding this?**

Pious Christian people always considered the sacred vestments of the priest as conveyors of divine power and reverenced them very

225. "συναφθέντας."
226. "ἐν Χριστῷ ἕνωσις."
227. "ἀνελαμβάνοντο."

much. Various old accounts and Synaxaria survive, which describe cures and even miracles that took place for faithful who with faith and piety kissed and touched the priest's vestments and other sacred cloth, which had been used in divine worship or which came into contact with tombs or relics of saints. That this does not run counter to the principles of our true and spiritual religion is seen even from the New Testament itself. It is sufficient that we recall the example of the woman suffering a flow of blood, who was healed of her incurable condition only with the touch of the fringe of Christ's garment (Luke 8:44) and the cures of sicknesses and expulsions of demons, which took place at Ephesos with "handkerchiefs" and "aprons" that came into contact with the apostle Paul's body (Acts 19:12). The fact that these signs have lessened nowadays stems from the decline of our faith and piety. And at that time crowds pressed upon Christ, but no one enjoyed the cure which that humble sick woman received. But how do we know whether in a soul that draws near with fear of God to touch the priest's vestments, is not also hidden the faith that made divine power come forth from the Lord and cure the woman suffering the flow of blood. Symeōn of Thessaloniki also having these things in mind and knowing the "divine grace" that sacred vestments possess, states in response to a similar question that the one who "kisses" the sacred vestments of the priest, during the great entrance "does nothing displeasing, but rather performs an act of faith and shall be saved, as also those who touched Christ's fringe were saved, because this also is on account of Him [Christ]" (Answer to *Question Twenty-Nine of Gabriēl of Pentapolis*. See also the answer to *Question Seventeen* of the same one).[228]

Now by analogy, one could say the same thing when also responding to the above question of the reverend priest. The priest's vestments "possess divine grace" and happy the person, who is moved by so much piety towards them and so much living faith towards God that he/she desires in this way to sanctify the various events of his/her life and to bless his/her work "beginning from the Lord." However, since most times such displays of piety take place

228. PG155:880c; PG 155:868c–869a.

entirely mechanically or even, let us say, with a clear or hidden inclination towards magic, it is incumbent on the priest also for the true benefit of the souls of the faithful, to give them the appropriate guidance every time, so that in this way their simple faith may acquire substance. What we note above can serve as a core of such a type of catechism.

## 35

**On the day of Theophany, must the dismissal take place before the enarxis of the Great Hagiasmos or at its end? If it takes place at the end, the faithful leave. How and when must it take place for the better order of the church?**

According to the explicit rubric of the Typikon in use, both on the day of Theophany and its eve, the service of the Great Hagiasmos is celebrated immediately after the prayer behind the ambōn, consecutively with the Divine Liturgy, and constitutes, we can say, a single service, since the second does not begin with a blessing and both together are also concluded with only one dismissal, the dismissal of the Divine Liturgy, because the service of the Hagiasmos lacks its own dismissal. As all the Typika and Euchologia in manuscript and print characteristically note, "after the priest says the prayer behind the ambōn, we all go forth to the baptistery[229] with the priest leading with candles and a censer; and we chant the troparia, in the plagal of the fourth tone, 'The voice of the Lord upon the waters'[230] . . . and so forth." Particularly, according to a few manuscripts, the prayer behind the ambōn is not even said, but the procession to the baptismal font starts immediately "after the Holy Liturgy is completed and after 'Arise. Having partaken . . .'" or "after the completion of the Divine Liturgy and the exclamation, 'For you are our sanctification . . . ,'" but the prayer behind the ambōn and the dismissal are said after the return to the temple. These things more markedly show the integration into the Liturgy of this service of the Great Hagiasmos. But even also the "Blessed be the name of the Lord . . ."[231] which,

229. "λουτῆρι."
230. "Φωνὴ Κυρίου ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων . . ."
231. "Εἴη τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου . . ."

according to later printed Typika, is said before "The voice of the Lord . . . ," was always said after the service of the Hagiasmos and the troparion, "Let us the faithful praise the greatness of God's dispensation towards us . . . ,"[232] which is not chanted nowadays, but at that time accompanied the return of the procession to the temple, as did "The voice of the Lord . . ." its exit. It is characteristic that the manuscripts which note that the service of Hagiasmos ended "after the dismissal of the Divine Liturgy" did not mean the full dismissal, since at the end of the Hagiasmos they record "Blessed be the name of the Lord . . ." and the complete dismissal. That this is the old and correct practice is clear also from the taxis observed up until nowadays in the monasteries of the Holy Mountain, according to which "The voice of the Lord . . ." begins immediately after the prayer behind the ambōn and "Blessed be the name of the Lord . . ." with the dismissal are said at the end of the Hagiasmos.

However, the problem that the priest who submits the question faces in practice is serious, because if according to the precise taxis he sprinkles all the people at the end of the service of the Great Hagiasmos, no one would remain for the dismissal at the end, since one-by-one they would depart after the partaking of and the sprinkling with the sanctified water. Certainly, this would take place to a greater extent, if the service was concluded as provided for by the Typikon, outside of the temple, at a fountain. Naturally, no one would have the patience to wait for the procession of the faithful at the Hagiasmos to conclude, in order to return with the priest to the temple and to hear the dismissal. But the blessing of the dismissal presupposes the presence of the faithful and not the empty temple. The solution will be found by analogy with other similar cases. The distribution of antidōron is a characteristic example. According to the strict old taxis, the dismissal should take place after the distribution of antidōron or at least, as up until nowadays on the Holy Mountain, "Through the prayers" is said after its distribution. However, nowadays, for the reasons that question references, it has become prevalent that the dismissal takes place first and the entire

232. "Ἀνυμνήσωμεν πιστοί, τῆς περὶ ἡμᾶς τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκονομίας τὸ μέγεθος..."

service closes with "Through the prayers . . . ," and afterwards the antidōron is shared, while the faithful, already free, are walking out of the temple.

The same thing can take place and is already done by many priests also for the Hagiasmos. The dismissal can take place immediately after the kontakion "You appeared today . . . "[233] and after the general sprinkling of the people, which is done during its chanting. The dismissal directly follows immediately right there, whether the Hagiasmos is done within the temple or even outside, without the procession returning to the temple. Both the sprinkling and the partaking of the sanctified water by each one of the faithful takes place separately afterwards. Thus, the taxis will not be disturbed, and the dismissal will be done, as it must, in the presence of the people.

## 36

**Is the ektenēs before the dismissal of the Small Hagiasmos similar to the customary ektenēs or is there a difference or is it completely omitted?**

Before the dismissal of the Small Hagiasmos, an ektenēs is provided for ("Have mercy on us, O God . . . Again we pray . . ." and so forth),[234] which however also contains the petition, "for deliverance . . . from famine, pestilence, earthquake . . ." and so forth,[235] "Hear us, O God . . . ,"[236] the blessing and the prayer of inclination, "O most merciful Master . . . ."[237] Customarily, special petitions are not appointed, but in practice they are confined to the entreaty on behalf of the archbishop and "of the health . . . of the pious and orthodox Christians"[238] and so forth. In some manuscripts, there are many more petitions of this ektenēs, differing from the "customary" and original ektenēs. Namely, they contain petitions "for all of the afflicted and sick, and those in need of the Lord's mercy and for our deliverance

233. "Ἐπεφάνης σήμερον . . ."
234. "Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεός . . . Ἔτι δεόμεθα . . . κλπ."
235. "ὑπὲρ τοῦ ρυσθῆναι . . . ἀπὸ λοιμοῦ, λιμοῦ, σεισμοῦ . . . κλπ."
236. "Ἐπάκουσον ἡμῶν, ὁ Θεός . . ."
237. "Δέσποτα πολυέλεε . . ."
238. "ὑγείας . . . τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν."

from every affliction, danger, trial, rising up of nations, civil war and sudden death,"[239] "for those who are suffering in sicknesses and for our brethren who are absent for good cause,"[240] "for our brother Christians who are suffering in exile and captivity and that our God who loves humankind be gracious to them for their restoration unto salvation,"[241] "for our deliverance from the eternal punishment of sinners and for our being deemed worthy of the kingdom of heaven,"[242] "for watering the earth with the rain of goodness,"[243] and others. It would be a labor of prayer in a newly prepared edition of our Euchologia that several such beautiful petitions be gathered from the manuscripts and that this service, so beautiful apart from this, be enriched in this manner.

## 37

**Is it correct for the dismissal of the Small Hagiasmos to be done as the Euchologion has it or is it similar to the dismissal of holy baptism and that of the Great Hagiasmos, as some maintain?**

The dismissal of the Small Hagiasmos is not similar to the dismissal of the service of holy baptism and that of the Great Hagiasmos, namely, it does not contain the phrase, "May He who deigned to be baptized in the Jordan by John for our salvation,"[244] but only "May Christ our true God, through the intercessions, and so forth."[245] All printed Euchologia and manuscripts also record this, which either simply state "and dismissal" or "also [the priest] makes a dismissal" and naturally

239. "ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν θλιβομένων καὶ ἀρρωστούντων καὶ ἐλέους Κυρίου ἐπιδεομένων καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λυτρωθῆναι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης θλίψεως, κινδύνου, πειρασμοῦ καὶ ἐπαναστάσεις ἐθνῶν καὶ ἐμφυλίου πολέμου καὶ αἰφνιδίου θανάτου."

240. "ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ἀσθενείαις καμνόντων καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν δι᾽ εὐλόγους αἰτίας ἀπολειφθέντων ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν."

241. "ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ἐξορίαις καὶ αἰχμαλωσίαις κακουχουμένων χριστιανῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ Ἴλεως αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ σωτηρίῳ ἀνακλήσει γενέσθαι τὸν φιλάνθρωπον Θεὸν ἡμῶν."

242. "ὑπὲρ τοῦ ρυσθῆναι ἡμᾶς τῆς αἰωνίου τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν κολάσεως καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ καταξιωθῆναι τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας."

243. "ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐπομβρίσαι τῇ γῇ ὑετὸν ἀγαθότητος."

244. "Ὁ ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου βαπτισθῆναι καταδεξάμενος, διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν."

245. "Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ταῖς πρεσβείαις . . ."

mean the "customary" dismissal, or when rarely they prescribe it, refer explicitly to that above without "May He who deigned to be baptized in the Jordan by John for our salvation." Consequently, this is also historically correct.

Besides, the service of the Small Hagiasmos has no relation to the Baptism of the Lord, as the service of holy baptism, nor is in its remembrance, as the service of the Great Hagiasmos, but has a separate character and different aim. Namely, water is sanctified by it in order to be used by the faithful for their sanctification and their spiritual and physical healing and for a blessing of their homes and the works of their hands, as it is beautifully phrased in the litany of peace's petitions and in the prayers of this service.

## 38

**When is the prayer for the woman who had a miscarriage read, on the fortieth day or sooner? Is the prayer of miscarriage read for her or also the prayers of the fortieth day of the woman whose child died?**[246]

In our Euchologia, there is a particular service "for a woman when she has a miscarriage"[247] or according to the manuscripts, "which is said for women in childbed after miscarrying the baby and whenever the child was born prematurely and with defects or even from some other necessity."[248] This small service begins, as usual, with "Blessed is our God . . ."[249] and includes the trisagion and so forth, the apolytikion of the day and theotokion, the prayer "O Master Lord our God, who was born from the holy Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary and as a baby was laid in a manger, do you yourself have regard for

246. For another point of view, see Nina Glibetić, "Orthodox Liturgical Rites at Pregnancy Loss: Ritual Responses to Miscarriage, Stillbirth, and Abortion in Late Byzantium," *Journal of Orthodox Christian Studies* 4 (2022): 151–179.

247. "εἰς γυναῖκα ὅταν ἀποβάληται."

248. "λεγομένη εἰς λεχούσας εἰς τὰς ἀποβαλούσας τὸ βρέφος καὶ ὁπόταν γεννηθῇ τὸ παιδίον παράκαιρον καὶ ἀτέλεστον ἢ καὶ ἐξ ἀνάγκης τινός."

249. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός . . ."

this your servant [name] who this day is in sins . . . ,"[250] and a dismissal. A simple comparison of this prayer with the second prayer of the service "for a woman in childbed"[251] ("O Master Lord our God, who was born from our wholly undefiled lady Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary . . .")[252] shows clearly that the "prayer for a woman when she has a miscarriage" is an adaptation of the former. Whatever pertained to the newborn child is removed and the forgiveness of the woman is especially sought, who "voluntarily or involuntarily"[253] fell into "murder,"[254] "when expelling what was conceived in her,"[255] according to the known ecclesiastical view. This prayer must be said on the day on which the woman had a miscarriage, as is not only clear from its correspondence with the other prayer, which is said "on the first day from the child's birth,"[256] but also from the phrase "today the one who fell into the sin of murder . . . and who miscarried what was conceived in her."[257] It is said in the home before the woman in confinement and other persons, who are attending and looking after her, as not only can be gathered from analogy with the prayer "for a woman in childbed,"[258] but also from the phrase that is found at the end of the prayer, "and forgive all those who are attending and who touched her . . . ."[259] Another prayer apart from this one is not provided by our Euchologia for women who miscarry; for this reason, also, this prayer is placed immediately after the service of the fortieth day in manuscripts and printed Euchologia.

---

250. "Δέσποτα Κύριε, ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν, ὁ τεχθεὶς ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας Θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, καὶ ἐν φάτνῃ ὡς βρέφος ἀνακλιθείς· Αὐτὸς τὴν παροῦσαν δούλην σου (τήνδε) τὴν σήμερον ἐν ἁμαρτίαις . . ."

251. "εἰς γυναῖκα λεχώ."

252. "Δέσποτα Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τεχθεὶς ἐκ τῆς παναχράντου Δεσποίνης ἡμῶν Θεοτόκου, καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας . . ."

253. "ἑκουσίως ἢ ἀκουσίως."

254. "φόνο."

255. "ἀποβαλομένην τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ συλληφθέν."

256. "τῇ α΄ ἡμέρα ἀπὸ τῆς γεννήσεως τοῦ παιδίου."

257. "σήμερον ἐν ἁμαρτίαις εἰς φόνον περιπεσοῦσαν . . . καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ συλληφθὲν ἀποβαλομένην."

258. "εἰς γυναίκα λεχώ."

259. "καὶ πάντας τοὺς παρευρισκομένους καὶ ἁψαμένους αὐτῆς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ συγχώρησον . . ."

The prayers of the fortieth day are said only for a woman who has given birth normally. Nowadays, this service has a twofold character, as otherwise is made clear also from its title, "service for a woman in childbed after forty days and for churching the child."[260] It applies both to the mother and to the baby. While the former enters the temple in order to give glory to God for her salvation and to obtain the blessing and ritual "purification" according to the model of the Theotokos and consistent with Old Testament legislation, which affected our Church's practice,[261] the latter enters the temple in order to be blessed and to "be churched," and to be presented to God, again according the model of the Lord, who on the fortieth day from his birth was presented in the temple of Jerusalem. The same service for the woman who gave birth normally, but whose child died in the meantime, was limited only to its first part. Thus, in almost the middle of the first prayer ("O Lord God, Pantokratōr, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . .")[262] precisely at the point that the petitions for the woman conclude and those that deal with the baby begin, the rubric is inserted, "Be it known that if the baby is no longer among the living, the prayer is read until here; then the priest says in an exclamatory manner, 'For you are a good God . . .'.[263]" It is not expressly stated in our present Euchologia whether the subsequent prayer of inclination, "O Lord our God, who became present in our midst for the salvation of the human race . . . ,"[264] must also be said, which is entitled "prayer for the mother of the child,"[265] or if a dismissal must immediately take place after the first prayer. Nevertheless, it is apparent that this prayer must also be attached, because it also refers only to the woman and because thus in this way

260. "Ἀκολουθία εἰς γυναῖκα λεχὼ μετὰ ἡμέρας μ' καὶ εἰς ἐκκλησιάσαι παιδίον."

261. On the influence of such Old Testament legislation, see Patrick Viscuso, *Sexuality, Marriage, and Celibacy* in *Byzantine Law: The Alphabetical Collection of Matthew Blastares, Selections from a Fourteenth-Century Encyclopedia of Canon Law and Theology* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2008).

262. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, παντοκράτωρ, ὁ Πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . ."

263. "Ὅτι ἀγαθός . . .'

264. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ παραγενόμενος ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων . . ."

265. "εὐχὴ εἰς τὴν μητέρα τοῦ παιδίου."

the form of our services is completed, which customarily is composed of two prayers, the second of which is, like this, "a prayer of inclination,"[266] but also from the rubric of a codex, which places the dismissal immediately after these two prayers in the event that "only the woman" should be present. No issue is raised regarding the subsequent prayers because they refer specifically to the baby and are said only when it is living.

If now sometimes the prayer "for a woman when she has a miscarriage" happens to be read not on the day of the miscarriage, but a little later, this takes place "by oikonomia" for clearly practical reasons, as we mentioned in questions twenty-nine and thirty, and has no relationship with the service of the fortieth day of the woman in childbed, whose "baby is not found among the living."

## 39

**During great feasts when many Christians approach for holy communion and the priest sees that the wine in the holy chalice is not going to be enough, what must he do? Is he able to add other wine before he runs out or not?**

In the second appendix of the first edition of a modern Greek translation of the works of Archbishop Symeōn of Thessaloniki, which was done during 1791 in Leipzig,[267] useful instructions for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy are contained under the title, "Teaching for priests and deacons."[268] This "Teaching" is not a work of Symeōn, but perhaps of the translator himself, the priest Polyzōēs Lampanitziōtēs from Ioannina.[269] However, it has been scrutinized "meticulously" by Patriarch

266. "εὐχὴ κεφαλοκλισίας."

267. Πολυζώης Λαμπανιτζιώτης, trans., *Τοῦ μακαρίου Συμεὼν Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης τὰ ἅπαντα εἰς τέσσερα μέρη διαιρεθέντα: ἐν οἷς περιέχονται διάλογοι ἐκκλησιαστικοί* (Leipzig: n.p., 1791).

268. "Διδασκαλία πρὸς τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ διακόνους."

269. Polyzōēs Lampanitziōtēs or Lampanitsiōtēs (Πολυζώης Λαμπανιτζιώτης or Λαμπανιτσιώτης), born 1726 Ioannina–death 1799 Venice. Βασίλειος Τσακίρης attributes the authorship of the "Teaching" to Kallinikos III of Constantinople (1713–1791, r. 1757), see Βασίλειος Τσακίρης, "Προσθῆκες στὴν ἑλληνικὴ βιβλιογραφία. Νέα στοιχεία γιὰ τὰ δύο ἔντυπα ἔργα τοῦ Πατριάρχη Καλλίνικου Γ'," *Ὁ Ἐρανιστής* 27 (2009): 253–258 (https://ejournals.epublishing.ekt.gr/index.php/eranistis/article/view/1460/1459, accessed Septem-

Kallinikos of Constantinople (likely the III [1757]),[270] and his synod. This appendix is also included, somewhat corrected, in the last reprint of this edition, which was done during recent years by the publishing house of B. Rēgopoulos in Thessaloniki.[271] The same instructions slightly modified are contained in the third chapter of also another old and useful book, which the sacred teacher (ἱεροδιδάσκαλος) Daniēl Geōrgopoulos wrote and published in Venice during 1833 under the title, *Sacred Anthology.*[272] Its fifth edition was done in Athens during 1898 by N. Michalopoulos. The "Teaching" records the following word-for-word concerning the topic that interests us: "O priest, learn also this, that if there are many receiving and they consume the mysteries, do not dare to add other wine into the holy chalice or more from the prosphora, because you will commit grave and mortal sin. Therefore, when such a thing might take place, he would instruct that the remaining ones to wait for tomorrow, during which when celebrating the Liturgy, he would commune them, or taking from the artophorion

---

ber 17, 2021). For further information on the author, see Π. Παναγιωτίδης, "Πολυζώης ὁ Λαμπανιτσιώτης καὶ αἱ ἐκδόσεις αὐτοῦ," *Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* 27 (1900): 325–328, who favors the spelling of the name with a "σ" in place of the "ζ" based on its geographical origin; and Στέφανος Μπέττης, "Πολυζώης Λαμπανιτσιώτης, ὁ μεγαλύτερος ἕλληνας ἐκδότης τοῦ ΙΗ' αἰώνα," *Ἠπειρωτικὴ Ἑστία* 16 (1967): 499–523.

270. Kallinikos III, patriarch of Constantinople (1713–1791, r. 1757).

271. Συμεών, Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θεσσαλονίκης, *Τὰ ἅπαντα, ἐκ τῆς ἀρχαίας εἰς τὴν ὁμιλουμένην μετενεχθέντα πρὸς ψυχωφελῆ χρῆσιν τῶν εὐλαβῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἱερέων καὶ λαϊκῶν: ἐγκρίσει τῆς ἱερᾶς συνόδου τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος μετὰ πολλῶν διορθώσεων κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον κείμενον* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, n.d.).

272. Daniēl Geōrgopoulos (Δανιὴλ Γεωργόπουλος) was born in Zygovisti, a village in western Arcadia, lived in the first half of nineteenth century, and was a scholar, teacher, and preacher. He actively participated in the Greek Revolution and was appointed "sacred preacher" (ἱεροκῆρυξ) by the Holy Synod of Greece. His best-known work was published in 1833 in Venice and was entitled, *Sacred Anthology: containing an explanation on the celebration of the seven mysteries of the Orthodox Church as well as various useful and necessary information for guiding the holy clergy* (*Ἱερὰ Ἀνθολογία: περιέχουσα ἑρμηνείαν ἐπὶ τῆς τελετῆς τῶν ἑπτὰ μυστηρίων τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας ἔτι δὲ διάφορα ἄλλα χρήσιμα καὶ ἀναγκαῖα πρὸς ὁδηγίαν τοῦ εὐαγοῦς Ἱερατείου*). This discussion of his life and work is based on Φώτιος Χρυσανθόπουλος, *Βίοι Πελοποννησίων Ἀνδρῶν* (Ἀθῆναι: Π.Δ. Σακελλάριος, 1888), 314, and Πολύκαρπος (Συνοδινός), "Δανιὴλ Γεωργόπουλος," *Θεολογία* 8 (1930): 72–78.

the Holy Bread that has been maintained for the sick, he would put it into the holy chalice and commune the entire people, as customary" (chapter 12).[273] The *Anthology* again nearly repeats the same things: "when there are many receiving and they consume the mysteries the priest must not dare also to put into the chalice other wine or more from the prosphora or commune them from the particles, because he commits grave and mortal sin, but either he might put Holy Bread from the holy artophorion, or he might leave them for tomorrow" (chapter 3, § 22).[274]

I think that the pious author is correct only in what he says relating to the addition of particles and other bread from the prosphora. In principle, it is not permitted that "he might leave for tomorrow" those who approach for holy communion. The priest must find a way to commune them, since they would have prepared and it is not prudent that we have the requirement for them to prolong their preparation more or to have them come to church also again the following day, a thing that perhaps would not be possible for most of them. As regards the Holy Bread, the priest could distribute it sparingly, consistent with the number of those approaching or add more from the holy artophorion. However, regarding the addition of wine, I do not see the reason for which it must be condemned so strictly and be considered as a grave and mortal sin. Was not the zeon added to the Precious Blood? And again, during the distribution of holy communion to the sick from the holy artophorion is the Holy Bread not soaked with wine or water? However, more characteristic is the example of the Liturgy of the Presanctified. Before holy communion, is not the Precious Body combined with common wine and water, which during the service of the prothesis is placed into the chalice without these elements being consecrated, and in a short time again, is not the zeon added? Do not the priest and faithful commune

273. Πολυζώης Λαμπανιτζιώτης, trans., *Τοῦ μακαρίου Συμεὼν Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης τὰ ἅπαντα εἰς τέσσερα μέρη διαιρεθέντα: ἐν οἷς περιέχονται διάλογοι ἐκκλησιαστικοί* (Leipzig: n.p., 1791), 480.

274. Δανιὴλ Γεωργόπουλος, *Ἱερὰ Ἀνθολογία: περιέχουσα ἑρμηνείαν ἐπὶ τῆς τελετῆς τῶν ἑπτὰ μυστηρίων τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας ἔτι δὲ διάφορα ἄλλα χρήσιμα καὶ ἀναγκαῖα πρὸς ὁδηγίαν τοῦ εὐαγοῦς Ἱερατείου* (Venice: Ἐκ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Τυπογραφίας Φραγκίσκου Ἀνδρεόλα, 1833; 5th ed., Ἀθῆναι: Ν. Μιχαλόπουλος, 1898), 102.

of the Precious Body and Blood from this chalice? By analogy, could the priest then do the same thing when the Precious Blood comes close to running out, adding wine in time without the fear of sin. Besides, this is always done in such circumstances by many very pious priests.

But it appears that the "Explanation" means something else. The author has in mind the possibility of the total depletion of the Precious Body and Blood found in the holy chalice. If this takes place from the priest's lack of foresight and bad management of the elements of the Holy Eucharist, then certainly another solution does not remain apart from the use of the Holy Bread of the artophorion, with the addition however again of unconsecrated wine.

## 40

### Is it possible for the priest to celebrate only the Divine Liturgy and to omit Matins?

As we wrote formerly when responding to question ten, the Divine Liturgy is completely independent from the service of Matins. And nowadays in our parishes, where the Divine Liturgy is celebrated consecutively with Matins, again, albeit "inaudibly,"[275] the dismissal of Matins takes place during the time that the doxology is chanted. In sacred monasteries and in the Slavic churches, and earlier also in parishes, the Divine Liturgy was celebrated after the reading of the Third and Sixth Hours, while the First Hour was attached together with the Matins and after it a complete dismissal and pause of the service occurred. Moreover, there are also Liturgies that are celebrated in conjunction with the service of Vespers, namely, normally during the afternoon, such as the Liturgies of Great Thursday and Great Saturday and of the eves of the Nativity and Theophany. In these cases, the relationship between Vespers and Liturgy is an organic one and both services together constitute a compound service. Elements of Vespers are not only inserted (introductory psalm, "Lord, I have cried to you,"[276] "O Gladsome Light,"[277] readings, and so forth), but mixed with elements of the Liturgy (entrance with the

275. "μυστικῶς."
276. "Κύριε ἐκέκραξα πρὸς σέ."
277. "Φῶς ἱλαρόν."

Gospel, trisagion, readings of the Liturgy, and so forth) and, finally, the Liturgy is continued. However, this does not take place in the connection of Matins and Liturgy, but they maintain their independence in spite of their connection in timing.

We must admit that this connection of the service of Matins with the Divine Liturgy accommodates in some way the faithful, because they attend both services, let us just say, with one effort, but we also damaged both services because, firstly, this degraded the service of Matins to a kind of preamble to the Liturgy and, secondly, because with this connection of two lengthy services one very long service was created, which lasts at least three hours. It is to be expected that this would very much wear out the faithful, if they wished to attend Matins from the beginning, a thing that naturally impedes them from maintaining a complete clarity of their spirit during the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, namely, at the time when they must be the most concentrated and devoted to the mystery. In monasteries, the service of Matins takes place at its normal time, namely, it begins a few hours after the Midnight Office and ends before the sun rises, but the Liturgy begins after a break of one hour or more. And Matins is celebrated always in the central temple of the monastery, the so-called "katholikon," while the Liturgy takes place in the side-chapels on a daily basis, and only on Sundays and feasts, in the katholikon. Again, in the Slavic churches, for accommodation of the faithful, Matins takes place linked with Vespers after the setting of the sun like a small vigil, while the Liturgy takes place early in the morning before the midday, as this is the case more or less for us during the services of Great Week.

I write these things in order to show that neither in time nor placement are both these services, Matins and Divine Liturgy, tied together. And in our land[278] when our priests celebrate private Liturgies, particularly in chapels, they begin the Divine Liturgy directly from "Blessed is the Kingdom . . ."[279] without any other preparatory service. Thus, they do nothing at variance with tradition. The so-called usual practice that the Matins is celebrated like a preparation

278. Greece.
279. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία . . ."

to the Divine Liturgy does not correspond to reality, because it does not have any preparatory element and the Liturgy has its own preparatory part that extends nearly up to the great entrance.

However, Matins is not omitted. The priest is obligated to celebrate or to attend the service of Matins when celebrated or even to read it to himself, every day, irrespective of whether or not he would celebrate the Divine Liturgy. He is the one that is praying on behalf of the people and celebrates the prescribed services daily. The Fathers explicitly decree this, and it is observed up until nowadays by our pious priests, not only in monasteries, but also in the temples of parishes. Certainly, one would wish for the faithful people to not be absent from the temples every day and especially on Sundays and feasts, and to attend and to participate in the two basic services of the daily cycle, namely, Vespers and Matins, and to be present always at the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, as Symeōn of Thessaloniki recommends (*Dialogue*, chapter 331),[280] but this is not possible practically. However, this does not relieve the priest from his duty, but rather obligates him more so to make up for the shortcomings and ignorance of the people.

## 41

**It is said that the seal that we apply to the prosphora has three lambs imprinted since during Great Lent three are required, one for the Sunday on which the Liturgy takes place and the other two for the Presanctifieds that take place during the course of the week. Is this explanation correct?**

On the seal that is imprinted upon the prosphora there are usually three lambs, namely, three squares with a cross, in four corners of which are inscribed ΙΣ – ΧΣ – NI – KA. We say "usually" because apart from the seal of this type, another is also used with only one lamb without the particles of the Theotokos and the nine orders.

I think the only correct explanation that can be given to the question why three lambs are depicted is practical need that perhaps will arise. Namely, either the middle lamb is for some reason

280. PG 155:596d–597b.

unfit for use in the Divine Liturgy, (that is to say, whether its seal is effaced or whether it had some bulge or whether any internal bubble had been created during the baking of the bread), or even if it is destroyed by a clumsy action of the priest during its cutting and excision.[281] In other words, this is about three lambs from which the priest can choose the most suitable or have the two for spares in case the one that he chose proved unfit for the Divine Liturgy. The suggested explanation must be dismissed because the lambs intended for the Liturgies of the Presanctified are necessarily excised from different prosphora. Never is more than one lamb excised from the same loaf.

## 42

**At what point of the Divine Liturgy or another service, must the priest bless with the precious cross?**

According to the correct practice that is prevalent in monasteries and in parish temples, the priest never blesses with the cross, but always with the hand. Some innovating priests are accustomed to bless with the precious cross at "And may the mercy of our great God..."[282] during the end of the prayer of the holy anaphora of the Divine Liturgy. However, they do this influenced evidently by the hierarchical Liturgy. Very correctly then the newest Hieratikon of the Apostolikē Diakonia notes that even in this case the blessing is given "by the hand." In the Slavic Orthodox churches at the dismissal the priest holds with both hands the cross of blessing and with it making the sign of the cross blesses at "have mercy and save us for he is good and the lover of humankind."[283] I do not know if the Slavs here innovate being also themselves influenced by the hierarchical Liturgy or if they follow, as it happens in most cases, a more ancient liturgical tradition that was not preserved among us. However, in our land,[284]

281. Phountoulēs appears to assume that the middle lamb is the first choice for the eucharistic offerings.

282. Καὶ ἔσται τὰ ἐλέη τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ . . ."

283. "ἐλεήσαι καὶ σώσαι ἡμᾶς, ὡς ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος καὶ ἐλεήμων Θεός."

284. Greece.

I repeat, neither even in this case nor even ever at some other time does the priest bless with the precious cross.

## 43

**Who must hold the lit candle at the point of holy baptism where the circling around the baptismal font takes place while "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ . . ."[285] is being chanted? The priest or the sponsor as is customary in many parishes?**

In the ancient church, baptism was always celebrated in connection with the Divine Liturgy. In other words, the priests baptized the catechumens, the bishop chrismated them, and after they dressed them with white clothing, they gave them each, also, one lit candle and they festively came into the temple during the small entrance. "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ..."[286] that we sing nowadays at baptism coincided precisely with this entrance of the newly illumined into the temple and is chanted instead of the trisagion of the Liturgy; the readings that follow are in place of the readings of the Liturgy that came next. Throughout all this time, the newly illumined stood upright in an honorific place before the holy bēma, always holding their lit candles, and communed at the end of the Divine Liturgy. Their candles were the symbol of the illumination of Christ, which they received during baptism, as Saint Grēgorios the Theologian states ("the candles which you all light, are thence a mystery of illumination," *Oration 40*).[287] They were given festively to the newly illumined as nowadays to newly tonsured monks, with the saying of the Lord, "Let your light so shine before men . . . ."[288] Especially in one manuscript is also preserved a beautiful address that the priest said while handing over a "lighted

285. "Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε . . ."

286. "Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε . . ."

287. Saint Grēgorios the Theologian, *Oration 40.* 46 in *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 38–41,* ed. Claudio Moreschini and trans. Paul Gallay, SC 358 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990), 308–309. Saint Grēgorios the Theologian (ca. 329–390) was a major Father of the Church and an archbishop of Constantinople (r. 380–381).

288. "Οὕτω λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων . . . ," (Matt 5:16).

taper" to the newly illumined: "Receive this candle and keep it inextinguishable, so that, when the Lord comes in a virginal marriage, you will be able to meet him with the wise virgins and all the saints in a heavenly courtyard and eternal life" (*Koutloumousiou 341*, see also *Sinai 966*).

After the prevalence of infant baptism, the sponsor, who on behalf of the catechumen "renounces the devil," "aligns himself/herself to Christ," and confesses faith in Him, both receives the candle and holds it together with the child. Symeōn of Thessaloniki also states precisely this: "If he is of age, the one being perfected stands in this way, he holds a candle in proof and glory of the most divine light, but if an infant the sponsor holds a candle on his behalf" (*Dialogue*, chapter 67).[289] Consequently, also during the sacred dance round the baptismal font during the chanting of "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ . . ." the sponsor is the one who must hold the candle instead of the newly illumined.

Let us take the opportunity here to note how much attention the priest must give to this apparently small detail of the service of baptism that passes by some priests almost unnoticed. The words of Saint Grēgorios, the gospel passage or the small address that accompanied the bestowal of the lit candle, and the commentary of Symeōn can reveal to the priest the mystical meaning and importance that they gave to this beautiful symbolic practice during the age of the height of our divine worship and faith.

In some places, the lit candle continues to be festively given with the saying, "Let your light so shine before men . . . ." The preservation, transmission, and emphasis of this practice not only is consistent with the ancient and correct practice of the Church, but also presents more strongly the joyful character of the mystery and can be a teaching opportunity for the faithful.

However, aside from the newly illumined or the sponsor, the priests and people also held lit candles during baptism in a display of joy and for an affirmation of the illumination of Christ. We may note this from the analogous candle holding that takes place during

289. PG 155:232d.

monastic tonsure where its rite has developed consistent with those things maintained in the service of baptism, and from the candle holding of all the faithful during the all-night vigil of Pascha, which was always connected with the baptism of catechumens. In some places, also preserved during baptism was this custom that during "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ . . ." and the readings, the priest and all present light and hold tapers. From there, comes the origin of the practice, which the inquiring priest mentions, namely the priest himself holding the candle during "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ . . . ." But as it was clear from what we wrote, wherever this ancient and beautiful custom is preserved, the newly illumined, namely the sponsor, must hold one candle, and the officiating priest who shares his joy or the faithful present would hold another one.

## 44

**Why does the fanning of the holy elements take place and how did it come about?**

## 45

**When the priest fans the precious gifts with the aēr, does he also use the precious cross at the end as some think or only the aēr?**

The "fanning" (ριπισμός), not "striking/beating" (ραπισμός) as sometimes it is badly said or even written, of the precious gifts from their uncovering during the recitation of the Sacred Symbol until the beginning of the prayer of the holy anaphora is done in our land[290] by the priest with the aēr folded. And the "shaking" (ἐπίσεισις) of the aēr during the recitation of the Symbol above the gifts has its origin in this fanning, even though various symbolic interpretations were later given to it. To the fanning is also owed the custom that is prevalent in our land[291] at "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ . . ."[292] that the

290. Greece.
291. Greece.
292. "Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . ."

priest blesses the people also holding in his hand the aër. Nowadays, we are unaware of the purpose of the fanning. However, it has its origins in purely practical reasons, like the covering of the gifts, namely, in warding off from the sacred vessels various insects that especially during the summer months abounded in the countries of the East, and even up until nowadays are not lacking from our temples. The *Apostolic Constitutions*, which were written at the end of the fourth century, gave orders to the deacons when fanning "gently" (ἠρέμα) to drive away "the small flying animals, that they may not come near to the cups" (Book 8. 12).[293] And in much later years, shortly before the Fall,[294] the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos of Constantinople again defines the purpose of the fanning that takes place "with all piety" "above the holy elements," as "for a fly or any such animals not to set" upon the precious gifts.[295]

For the fanning they used either special liturgical fans made "from thin skins, or the feathers of the peacock, or fine linen,"[296] as the *Apostolic Constitutions* record, or "φακιόλια," namely, cloths, as Iōannēs Moschos records in his *Meadow*[297] or even the veils themselves of the precious gifts, as again Philotheos clarifies in his *Diataxis* when writing: "and if there is a fan, taking this with his hand [the deacon] fans over the holy elements with all piety…but if there

293. *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.12.3 in *Les Constitutions Apostoliques*, ed. and trans. Marcel Metzger, SC 336 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1987), 178–179. Translation modified from *Fathers of the Third and Fourth Centuries*, ANF 7 (Buffalo, NY: The Christian Literature Company, 1907), 486.

294. The fall of the Byzantine capital Constantinople to the Ottomans in 1453.

295. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 11.

296. *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.12.3 (SC 336:178–179). Translation modified from ANF 7:486.

297. Saint Iōannēs Moschos, *Pratum Spirituale* 196 (PG 87:3081a). This sixth century monastic author wrote an account of his travels to the monasteries of Palestine and Egypt in the *Spiritual Meadow (Λειμὼν Πνευματικός)*, was a supporter of Chalcedonian orthodoxy in Alexandria, and eventually died in Rome (controversy exists among scholars whether this was Old or New Rome), where he composed the latter work that reflects his support for the Fourth Ecumenical Council. This discussion is based on Angelo Di Berardino, ed., *The Eastern Fathers from the Council of Chalcedon (451) to John of Damascus (†750)*, trans. Adrian Walford, vol. 4 of *Patrology*, Johannes Quasten (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co. Ltd, 2000), 301–303.

is no fan, he does this with the veil."[298] In addition, also, it is very likely that the veils originated from the fans. However, there were also fans fashioned from metal in a small six-winged form, like we see in frescos and as preserved in the Slavic churches. These are precisely the hexapteryga of our temples that lost their ancient purpose but remained in their ancient place behind the holy table and accompany, as before, the procession of the holy elements during the great entrance.

The priest was not originally involved in the fanning. This was done by the deacons who stood behind the holy table or at its sides and had the task of fanning the holy elements throughout the duration of the Liturgy, from their uncovering until the moment of holy communion, and interrupted this for a little time, for reasons certainly of piety, during the consecration of the precious gifts. This took place up until the period of Philotheos and is done up to the present in the Slavic churches. However, the need for the priest to serve alone that occurred regularly in the years of the Tourkokratia,[299] limited the fanning to the minimum, namely, from the uncovering of the gifts until the beginning of the prayer of the anaphora, as we mentioned at the start, and of necessity was done by the priest with the handiest means available, namely, with the veil, the aër.

In a few words, this is the history and purpose of the fanning of the precious gifts. The fanning with the cross, wherever it wrongly takes place, has neither support in tradition, nor can it even be compatible with the ancient purpose of this practice.[300] It perhaps originated from a misunderstanding of the movement of the fanning, which they considered a blessing of the gifts in a crosswise fashion. A consequence of this misunderstanding was that the cross was also introduced in order that the blessing be more complete than it would have been if it had taken place with the aër.

298. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 11.

299. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

300. The fanning.

## 46

**The inhabitants of the village, in which I serve as priest, maintain the custom that they fast all Fridays of Great Lent from morning until evening without even taking water into their mouths. But during the evening after the end of the service of the Salutations[301] they request antidōron from the priest. They do not also so respect the remaining days of the fast, content with the fasting of each Friday, thinking that this constitutes the be-all and end-all. I am informed that this custom originates from the Turkish Ramadan. Must this be continued or not?**

The Friday fasting, as maintained by tradition, in the village of the priest that submitted the question, preserves, no matter how odd it appears, the most ancient form of Christian fasting. The ancient Christians refrained from any type of nourishment during fasting days and "ate dry foods around the ninth hour,"[302] namely they ate fasting foods around the end of the day. They did an "extension,"[303] namely they did not eat at all for one, two, three, or even more days, depending on their zeal and physical stamina. If one pays attention to the services of Great Lent and Great Week and other days of strict fasting such as the eves of the Nativity and Theophany, the Liturgies whether of the Presanctified or of Basileios the Great, which are provided at these times, are linked with the service of Vespers and at the beginning were not celebrated as nowadays in the morning, but in the afternoon at the prescribed hour for Vespers; and the faithful communed at that time, since they had remained "fasting"[304] throughout the day. After communion, the fast concluded with the xerophagy that we mentioned. Later, this was shown to be unworkable because the zeal of people lessened and because the work and the distraction of the faithful who live within the world compelled them to break the fast early in the morning or at least mid-day. Thus, the afternoon Liturgies were transferred to the morning, but the connection with the Vespers remained as a remembrance of the old

301. "ἡ ἀκολουθία τῶν Χαιρετισμῶν."
302. "ἐξηροφάγουν περὶ τὴν ἐνάτην."
303. "ὑπέρθεσιν."
304. "ἄσιτοι."

practice. However, in the sacred monasteries and particularly on the Holy Mountain, where both zeal is not absent and living conditions are regulated consistent with the liturgical life of the Church, the daylong fast, the "extension," the afternoon Liturgies, and communion after the ninth hour on fasting days are preserved to this day. Only after the service of Vespers is a single trapeza offered.

In the village of the priest who is asking the question, where this ancient manner of fasting is maintained, it is rather certain, as it is correctly observed, that the daylong fast is practiced under the influence of the Turks' Ramadan, with whom for centuries they lived together up until even nowadays.[305] And again, the Turks in turn, without today realizing it, have imitated and maintained, naturally in their own manner, the old way of Christian fasting. Therefore, I do not think that the custom of these Christians must be condemned, since certainly they do not observe it as a Muslim practice, but purely as a Christian fast. Certainly, it would be good for this not to be confined only to Fridays of Lent. But we must not forget that the days of Christian fasting, as they have been developed under monastic influence, exceed half the days of the year. And the Church will not stop emphasizing this perfect ideal and calling upon her children to do their best to observe it, but in order for us to be pragmatic, we must realize ahead of time that this is possible for only a few people. Life's hard struggle and the exhaustion of working, diseases, bodily infirmities, the general malnutrition especially of poor families, and let us be honest here, the lukewarm faith of us all, compel the Church to overlook many things and to also practice all possible "oikonomia" on the question of fasting. Let us not then discourage these people that still continue to have an attitude of sacrifice and asceticism. Because it is not a small matter to remain hungry and thirsty throughout the day in order to be well-pleasing to God in the way that their tradition preserved.

305. There are regions in Northern Greece, particularly in Thrace, where significant Muslim communities continue to exist.

## 47

**The Christian women of my village go to the hodja and ask his prayers. Is this permissible?**

This is certainly not permissible. If the sacred canons prohibit the faithful to receive blessings from heretics that they do not even call "blessings" (εὐλογίας) but rather "follies"(ἀλογίας), much more must this activity be condemned of women, pious perhaps in other ways, who ask to be blessed by the clergy of another religion. Naturally, this is explainable by the two religious communities living together for a long time and by the inherent respect of a person for anything sacred, even if it does not belong to the religion that the individual professes. Thus, many practices of pre-Christian worship were preserved among us that nevertheless took a new Christian content or lost their idolatrous character; or sacred places, springs, caves, and temples have been inherited, which were turned into Christian places of worship, after they had been consecrated and dedicated in honor of Christ and His saints. In many places, for the same reasons, the Muslims manifested an analogous devotion to our worship, temples, and priests.

A task of the priest is to instruct Christians in the appropriate manner and to dissuade them from receiving the blessings of another religion's clergy. Certainly, this does not mean that they must go to the other extreme, and to hate or detest him. Not at all. Respect and polite conduct are traits of cultivated Christian persons. Religious fanaticism and the dark passions that it breeds, are foreign to Christ's spiritual religion, and whenever they have dominated out of human weaknesses or excessive sacred zeal, they have harmed and sometimes tarnished Christians.

## 48

### How many hours after holy communion must one not spit?

There does not exist any legislation or a relevant canon on the question. Out of devotion to the mystery, the custom is prevalent for the one who communes not to spit throughout that day on which he/she communed. And certainly, this custom is praiseworthy and commendable. If the one who involuntarily would vomit after holy communion is penanced by Saint Iōannēs the Faster with 40 days abstinence from holy communion and other penances, much more sinful must be viewed a completely voluntary action of a person that certainly renders disrespect and who possibly could be a cause of desecration to the sacred particles that may remain in the mouth of the one who communed.[306]

## 49

### Must we commune persons unable to speak and those mentally deficient?

Certainly, provided they also have been baptized and are members of the mystical Body of Christ, of the Church. The grace of the mysteries also acts on them, perhaps even more effectively than on us who are laden with evils and passions. The reception of holy communion is permitted even to those afflicted with demons, according the third canonical answer of Timotheos of Alexandria and the fourth of Nikolaos of Constantinople,[307] under the condition, however, that they shall not blaspheme and shall not "repudiate"[308] the mystery, namely, according to the commentary of Blessed Niko-

306. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 4:445. The canons of Orthodox ecclesiastical legislation are ordinarily divided into the following categories by source: The canons of the Holy Apostles, ecumenical councils, local councils, and patristic texts attributed canonical authority. These patristic texts include the present referenced text attributed to Saint Iōannēs of Constantinople the Faster (r. 582–595).

307. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 4:332–333, 421. The canons attributed Saint Timotheos of Alexandria (d. 385) and Nikolaos III of Constantinople (r. 1084–1111) are also included among those patristic texts received into the formal corpus of Orthodox canon law as possessing canonical authority.

308. ἐξαγορεύουν.

dēmos of the Holy Mountain,[309] "that they do not for instance assert that this is common bread and wine, not believing that it is truly the Body and Blood of Christ."[310]

## 50

**Is a priest able to celebrate the Divine Liturgy without a chanter?**

During the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, the presence of the people is necessary. The priest is not able to celebrate the Liturgy on his own. This is hardly necessary for anyone to say. A glance at the text of the Divine Liturgy is sufficient to show how at every point the presence of the people is presupposed. They will answer "amen" to the priest's exclamations and "Lord have mercy" to the litany of peace, to the synaptes, and to the ekteneis, "grant this O Lord" to the petitions, and "and with your spirit" to blessings, and they will chant the different hymns that are inserted at its various points, such as "It is truly meet,"[311] "We have seen the true light,"[312] "Blessed be the name of the Lord,"[313] and so forth. Furthermore, the deacon or priest asks the people to pray with "let us pray"[314] and "let us ask"[315] and puts the prayer's requests in their mouths. In addition, the blessings are addressed to the people and not to the objects found in the

309. Saint Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain (Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης) (ca. 1748–1809), a hieromonk of the Mount Athos canonized by the Church of Greece in 1955, was one of the most prolific Orthodox theologians in the modern period. The range of his writings covers almost every aspect of theological study. His most important canonical work, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας (Rudder of the Noetic Ship of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Orthodox)*, more commonly referred to as *Πηδάλιον* or *Rudder*, was first published in 1800 and continues to be one of the main collections of canon law presently used in the Greek-speaking Orthodox churches.

310. Ἀγάπιος Ἱερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 668.

311. "Ἄξιόν ἐστιν."

312. "Εἴδομεν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν."

313. "Εἴη τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου εὐλογημένον."

314. "δεηθῶμεν."

315. "αἰτησώμεθα."

temple. And the prayers continually speak of the "people present." In other words, the Divine Liturgy is a dialogue between priest and people, a sacrifice that is offered by the entire Christian community, or on its behalf, in which priest and people have their own and strictly defined roles in this dialogue, which without the presence of one, a dialogue ceases to exist, and without the participation of one, whatever the other says becomes unintelligible.

The level of the necessity for the participation of the people is also seen from this prayer of anaphora that is interrupted in order that the people might say what belongs to them, which, without this, the continuity of the entire prayer is lost. For example, "Singing the triumphal hymn . . . and saying"[316] and the people say the continuation, "Holy, holy . . . ,"[317] and again the priest continues, "Together with these blessed powers, we . . . ."[318] Or, "Your own of your own we offer to you [the manuscripts have "offering"[319]] in all and for all"[320] and the people, "We hymn you . . ."[321] and the priest continues, "Again we offer to you . . . ."[322] Nowadays, we mean the chanter when saying "people," who—either since the melodies of the chanting became difficult over time, or from a lack of grammatical, liturgical, or musical preparation—ceased to actively participate in the Divine Liturgy and to chant what belongs to them, leaving to the chanters to monopolize their rights.

With this understanding, in the absence of a chanter, namely, without a person that is present and represents the people through the chanting, the celebration of the Divine Liturgy is not permitted. Furthermore, also, during divine worship, fundamental decency necessitates that someone responsibly and worthily, as much as possible, chant the hymns belonging to the people. In the West, where all priests perform the Liturgy daily, sometimes without the presence of the people, unbefitting things of such a type were not lacking,

316. "Τὸν ἐπινίκιον ὕμνον ᾄδοντα . . . καὶ λέγοντα."
317. "Ἅγιος, ἅγιος . . ."
318. "Μετὰ τούτων καὶ ἡμεῖς τῶν μακαρίων δυνάμεων . . ."
319. "προσφέροντες."
320. "Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέρομεν κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα."
321. "Σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν."
322. "Ἔτι προσφέρομέν σοι . . ."

namely that the priest celebrates Liturgy by himself without anyone present, but even there it was ordered that at least one person attend to minister and to give the responses to the priest. And in the East, Liturgies of such a type are attested to, which were done by ascetics especially, without the presence of the people or at least one of the faithful, but this is a rare exception that took place in circumstances of extreme need. And again, the authors of the lives of these saints, who perceived the impropriety of the matter, observe how the angels concelebrated and gave the responses to what was said by the celebrant. These things are just theoretical.

In practice, it is true that our priests often are compelled by necessity to do things by themselves and act as chanters. There are small parishes in isolated villages, in which the temple and the village do not have a person who can even passably "liturgize with,"[323] as it is customary to say, the priest. Aside from this circumstance, also, for private Liturgies,[324] especially in small villages and chapels, there exists a scarce chance of a chanter participating in the Divine Liturgy. The priest also again is compelled to face the same problem. And in both cases, the priest must first know that he can never omit what belongs to the people, inasmuch as these things constitute, as we saw above, an integral part of the entire Divine Liturgy. But also, neither does it fit his particular role as a priest to also say the people's responses. Especially at some points, this approach can lead to absurdity. For example, the same one is wishing peace to the people and reciprocating about himself, "And with your spirit." At other points, this antithesis is less, like at the antiphons, at the troparia of the entrance, at the trisagion, at the triumphal hymn, at "We have

323. "ξελειτουργήση."

324. In the Church of Greece, so-called "private Liturgies" are celebrated in small chapels on private lands or those belonging to parishes and monasteries. These Liturgies are celebrated on the basis of ad hoc requests from the faithful, often out of affinity or spiritual obligation to the saint for whom the chapel is dedicated. Although these ad hoc Liturgies are technically open to others, they are not part of the official parish calendar nor even made known to other congregants. The phrase "we opened the church" (ἀνοίξαμε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν) is an expression often heard in villages after a family has arranged and provided for the celebration of such a Liturgy, especially in the case of chapels not normally used.

seen the true light," and so forth, but again, the priest will find it hard, because he will not know when to say the prayers and an interruption will occur during the Divine Liturgy.

In the case of small villages, the priest must in every way possible encourage the residents to approach the analogion[325] and to assist in the Liturgy. Great grammatical knowledge is not required, nor exceptional melodic voices. Zeal and effort can easily make up for them. The teachers and children of the schools can also assist in this. If he is "tenacious," the priest can slowly form good chanters from pious persons and well-intentioned children, who will surely exist even in the smallest village. This his effort for a Liturgy worthy of glorifying God shall be blessed by Him and will find a response in His flock. There exist examples of good priests who from nothing created beautiful choirs and good chanters in their villages and fostered the participation of the people in the Divine Liturgy, as there exist examples also of others cantankerous or indifferent, who alienated from the analogion the ones already there and disaffected the people and children from divine worship.

Again, in private Liturgies, in which pious women are often present, they also can be encouraged to say at least the simplest responses and the most familiar hymns—such as "amen," "Lord have mercy," "Grant this O Lord," "To you, O Lord," and the antiphons, "Holy God," some well-known troparia and so forth, the creed and the "Our Father"—either recited or in the simplest and easiest melodies. This will have a desirable twofold result that they will participate with more vigor in worship, and thus, they will also better understand and love it and will become accustomed to actively praying during it, and that they will lighten the priest's burden, and the Divine Liturgy will be celebrated consistent with its spirit and letter.

Again, the priest can chant a difficult troparion or a cheroubikon or "It is truly meet," if the congregation cannot recite it simply. Let

325. "ἀναλόγιον." In parish practice, the analogion is often a multi-sided slanted stand incorporating shelving space for the storage of liturgical books for the reader and chanter. It is sometimes described in English as the "chanting stand" or "lectern."

the priest not forget that simple melodies are also more consistent with the tradition of the Church. On the Holy Mountain, for example, where the ancient traditions are observed strictly, the "Amen," "Lord have mercy," "Grant this O Lord," "And with your spirit," "We lift them up to the Lord," "It is proper and right," "Holy, holy," "We hymn you," and so forth, are said not by the choir, but by a simple monk, the "reader," in a very simple melody, almost in the tone of speaking or reading.

From everything this question gave us an opportunity to say, we can then draw the conclusion that the celebration of the Divine Liturgy is permitted without the participation of a chanter as long as needs impose it, but it is imperative for the people, who are indispensably present during the Liturgy even in the least percentage, to take part in it, with the encouragement and assistance of the priest, as much and as best as possible.

## 51

**When and why is the curtain of the beautiful gate closed?**

## 52

**Must the priest commune, with the curtain of the beautiful gate open or closed?**

The closing of the curtain of the beautiful gate during the koinōnikon does not have any relationship to the communion of the priest that takes places during this time. The explanation that circulates nowadays, that namely the beautiful gate is closed during the communion of the priest either for reasons of decorum or in order that the priest might better concentrate, is completely erroneous. Neither does the open gate interrupt the priest's attention, since he has his back turned towards it and since it remains open at other more significant points of the Divine Liturgy, like for example during the consecration of the precious gifts, nor again is the sight of the priests communing unseemly. On the contrary, he can also engender holy feelings and set an example for the faithful reminding them of something that oftentimes we forget, that namely the Divine Liturgy takes place

for Christians to commune, and the things being performed are not simply for show.

The closing of the beautiful gate is owed to mystical and symbolic reasons, which nowadays have faded away, but earlier were very widespread and played an important role in the formation and development of divine worship. Thus, the curtain was a symbol "of the heavenly tabernacle around God, where the companies of angels and saints are at rest,"[326] according to Symeōn of Thessaloniki (*Explanation,* 6, *Dialogue*, chapters 133 and 139), namely it was the means of segregating the throne of God and heaven that the bēma represents, from the earthly world, which the nave represents, or of earthly from heavenly things, of the "noetic" from the "sensible," again according to Symeōn of Thessaloniki.[327] The curtain also recalls that other curtain of the tabernacle of witness and of the Jewish temple, which separated the inaccessible holy of holies from the sanctuary. The former was the dwelling place of God and the "resting place" of His ark and only the archpriest once a year had the right to enter "not without blood" (Heb 9:7). Thus, also, in the Christian temple the curtain separated heaven from the earth and hid the mysteries "so that the people are not able to observe the priests performing priestly functions," according to the *Confession of Kritopoulos.*[328] For

326. Translation from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika,* 90–91.

327. PG 155:341a–344d, 348c–348d.

328. Μητροφάνης Κριτόπουλος, *Ὁμολογία τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Καθολικῆς καὶ Ἀποστολικῆς, συγγραφεῖσα ἐν ἐπιτομῇ διὰ Μητροφάνους ἱερομονάχου Πατριαρχικοῦ τε Πρωτοσυγγέλου τοῦ Κριτόπουλου, Confessio catholicae et apostolicae in Oriente Ecclesiae, conscripta compendiose per Metrophanem Critopulum hieromonachum quondam et patriarchalem Constantinopolitanum protosyngelum,* edita et latinate donate a Joanne Horneio, Acad. Jul. P. (Helmstedt: n.p., 1661), 104. Mētrophanēs Kritopoulos (1589–1639) was patriarch of Alexandria (r. 1636–1639) and author of this confessional statement composed 1624–1625, which may be found in Ἰωάννης Καρμίρης, *Τὰ Δόγματα καὶ Συμβολικὰ Μνημεῖα τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας,* 2nd ed. (Graz: Akademische Druck u. Verlagsanstalt, 1968), 2:498–561. The specific quote above is found in chapter 9 of the *Confession,* on page 538 of the Karmirēs edition. Among the many studies of the *Confession,* see the introduction of Karmirēs, 489–497; David Heith-Stade, "Eastern Orthodox Ecclesiologies in the Era of Confessionalism," *Theoforum* 41 (2010): 373–385; and Colin Davey, *Pioneer for unity: Metrophanes Kri-*

this reason also, for someone to be deemed worthy to enter "within the innermost curtain" into the holy of holies, where "the holy angels desire to peer . . . and to behold with one's own eyes the presence of the holy anaphora,"[329] according to the prayer after the fifth gospel of the service of unction, or to be deemed worthy "to enter into the place of the tabernacle of God's glory, to be behind the curtain and observe the holy of holies,"[330] according to the prayer of the curtain of the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, this was viewed, quite rightly, as the highest honor that a human being could experience in this world.

During ancient times, the curtain was closed immediately after the placing of the precious gifts upon the altar during the great entrance, "because it is not meet that the mysteries be seen by all, but by only those exercising the priesthood," as again Symeōn of Thessaloniki observes (*Explanation,* 83),[331] or as the same one adds, "because this is also the order in the age to come, both that the lofty things are not seen by the inferior ones also below, nor that the mysteries are known to all, since even then Jesus will be concealed to many and revealed gradually," (*Dialogue*, chapter 98).[332] But the beautiful gate was opened after the kiss and the recitation of the Symbol, because, as we refer again to the words of Symeōn, "also then [namely in the age to come] the vision will be proportionate to those making progress and those more perfect. And after the Symbol has been proclaimed and the profession of faith acknowledged by everyone, love and unity among angels and men occurs and is shown through the kiss, because also then there will be concord and all will be friends and beloved, and Jesus will be the most beautiful sacrificial victim in the midst of all his saints, being the peace and the unity of all, priest and victim, uniting all and being united to them,

*topoulos (1589–1639) and relations between the Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Reformed churches* (London: British Council of Churches, 1987).

329. "παρακύψαι οἱ ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι ἐπιθυμοῦσι . . . καὶ θεάσασθαι αὐτοψεὶ τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς ἁγίας ἀναφορᾶς."

330. "εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τόπον σκηνώματος δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἔσω τε γενέσθαι τοῦ καταπετάσματος καὶ τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων κατοπτεῦσαι." B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 80.

331. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 133.

332. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 251.

though in proportion; for not all will share in Him directly," (*Dialogue*, chapter 98).[333] The gate remained open until the end of the Liturgy "that all the people can [after the confession of the correct faith and the kiss] observe through the chancel screen those offering the sacrifice and these things offered" (*Confession of Kritopoulos*).[334]

In contrast, in the sacred monasteries, where, as we have repeatedly written, ancient liturgical customs are piously preserved, the curtain closes after the great entrance, as we mentioned, but it remains closed throughout the remainder of the Divine Liturgy until the end of the koinōnikon. The blessings of the priest are given with the curtain completely closed, or after it is drawn back momentarily at the time of the blessing. But our old-time priests, who learned to officiate as priests from other older ones and were strongly influenced by the monastic liturgical practice, did the same thing, with the difference that they opened the curtain during the recitation of the Symbol and closed it after "Let us give thanks to the Lord,"[335] before they begin the prayer of the holy anaphora. For many reasons, this practice of the monasteries should not be viewed as innovative. It is known that this practice is distinguished for its conservatism. It appears then that also in this case the monasteries preserved a very old tradition which was in existence perhaps at the same time as that which Symeōn and Kritopoulos attest for us, and which was observed by those who are more conservative. Furthermore, it is also the prevalent practice in the Slavic Orthodox churches, where also they are very conservative on questions of divine worship. The same thing is also done in monasteries and parish temples during the Liturgy of the Presanctified; the beautiful gate is closed after the en-

333. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 251.

334. Μητροφάνης Κριτόπουλος, *Ὁμολογία τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Καθολικῆς καὶ Ἀποστολικῆς, συγγραφεῖσαι ἐν ἐπιτομῇ διὰ Μητροφάνους ἱερομονάχου Πατριαρχικοῦ τε Πρωτοσυγγέλου τοῦ Κριτόπουλου, Confessio catholicae et apostolicae in Oriente Ecclesiae, conscripta compendiose per Metrophanem Critopulum hieromonachum quondam et patriarchalem Constantinopolitanum protosyngelum*, edita et latinate donate a Joanne Horneio, Acad. Jul. P. (Helmstedt: n.p., 1661), 104; Ἰωάννης Καρμίρης, *Τὰ Δόγματα καὶ Συμβολικὰ Μνημεῖα τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed. (Graz: Akademische Druck u. Verlagsanstalt, 1968), 2:538.

335. "Εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ."

trance of the Presanctified Gifts and is opened only at "With fear of God . . . ." Similarly, also, in the Armenian church, the small curtain of the ciborium over the holy table is drawn during the time of the celebrant's communion.[336]

Therefore, we conclude from all these things that the closing of the curtain of the beautiful gate at the time of the koinōnikon that has been observed up until nowadays in parishes, has its basis in ancient liturgical custom, as is witnessed from the practice of the monasteries and of the Slavic churches, and even the Armenian church, and as is witnessed also from certain old codices. It was shown more resilient in liturgical development because it was associated with very striking liturgical symbolism. The opening of the beautiful gate at "With fear of God" was viewed as a depiction of the rolling back of the stone from the Lord's tomb during the Resurrection and the appearance of the holy chalice as an appearance of the resurrected Christ Himself. The closing again of the curtain after the great entrance until the recitation of the Symbol, as it is preserved again in monasteries, in the Slavic churches, in the Liturgy of the Presanctified, and as is witnessed from codices, Symeōn of Thessaloniki, and Kritopoulos, has also itself its origins in the Church's ancient liturgical practice.

At the time of the celebration of the mystery, namely from the Symbol until the elevation of the Holy Bread, it appears that two practices were in existence at the same time, as also nowadays. And while the closing of the curtain emphasizes more the mystical character of the Divine Liturgy, nevertheless its celebration with the curtain open facilitates better the participation of the people and emphasizes more the collective character of the Divine Liturgy. Certainly, in the ancient period, the priest celebrated looking towards the people, standing in the back part of the holy table, a thing that facilitated even more the participation of the people. At least in parishes, the imitation of the monastic practice would not then be ad-

336. For a text and analysis of the Armenian Liturgy, see Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 3΄ (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 365–426.

visable, which during the period of the Tourkokratia,[337] as it appears, the parish priests also followed. With the closing of the beautiful gate during the koinōnikon and from the great entrance until the creed, where this tradition is still prevalent, the mystical character of the Divine Liturgy is emphasized sufficiently. With its opening in the time between them, the demand for participation of the people more directly in the mystery celebrated is being satisfied sufficiently in this manner. Thus, both relevant traditions can also be reconciled, which, as we have seen, are equally ancient and equally venerable.

## 53

**There exists a custom that priests read the prayer of absolution, "O Lord, Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, shepherd and lamb . . . ,"[338] to those about to commune. Is this permitted when they are not confessors?**

The old-time priests, whether or not they were confessors, before holy communion indispensably read the prayer, "O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, shepherd and lamb . . . ." Many of the faithful who come forward for holy communion continue to request this and many of our priests continue to read it. On the other hand, many of our younger educated priests refuse to read this prayer to those about to commune, either on the grounds that they are not confessors, or because they do not wish to create delusions among the people that their sins are thus forgiven; and they refer the ones who request "a reading" to confessors for confession. In other words, they view this prayer as a prayer for remission of sins, which must be read by the spiritual father to the one confessing after his/her confession. Indeed, many confessors read this prayer during confession as a prayer of absolution and in certain manuscripts this prayer is characterized as "a prayer, which the spiritual father prays on behalf of his spiritual child when confessing for him his personal

337. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

338. "Κύριε, Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, Υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, ποιμὴν καὶ ἀμνέ . . ."

sins."[339] The examination of the texts and of the early practice of the Church will show us which is the correct practice that our priests must observe in the matter in question.

Let us first look at the text of the prayer.[340] The first thing that surprises us is that nowhere is there any mention of confession and remission of sins confessed. In contrast, in the other prayer "O Lord our God, who to Peter and the sinful woman . . .,"[341] there is a clear reference to confession of sins ("accept the confession of your servant [name] . . ."). [342] The "another prayer"[343] for those who have confessed, "God who became man for us . . . ,"[344] also speaks in the same manner: "and may He accept all those things whatsoever you [declared][345] before Him to my unworthiness . . . ." The "prayer for those who have confessed," "May God who, through Nathan the Prophet forgave David . . . ,"[346] also states the same thing: "[May our Savior and Lord Jesus Christ himself forgive][347] whatsoever now you declared to my mediocrity before Him and those things which you have forgotten . . . ."[348] Similarly, also, the "prayer of confession,"[349] "God the righteous one, who bore flesh on account of us,"[350] "what-

339. "εὐχή, ἣν εὔχεται ὁ πνευματικὸς πατὴρ ὑπὲρ πνευματικοῦ αὐτοῦ παιδὸς ἐξομολογηθέντος αὐτῷ τὰ ἴδια ἁμαρτήματα."

340. The quotations that follow appear derived from Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 537–540.

341. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τῷ Πέτρῳ καὶ τῇ πόρνῃ . . . ," (Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 537).

342. "πρόσδεξαι τὴν ἐξομολόγησιν τοῦ δούλου σου δεῖνος . . . ," (Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 537).

343. "εὐχὴ ἑτέρα," (Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 537).

344. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ δι᾽ ἡμᾶς ἐνανθρωπήσας . . . ," (Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 537).

345. "καὶ ταῦτα πάντα ἀναδέξηται ὅσα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐξεῖπας τῇ ἐμῇ ἀναξιότητι . . ." "The word "ἐξεῖπας" is in the Goar text, but missing from the Phountoulēs's quotation of the prayer, (Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 537).

346. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ συγχωρήσας διὰ Νάθαν τῷ προφήτῃ Δαβίδ . . . ," (Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 538).

347. The phrase "αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς συγχωρήσαι πάντα" is in the Goar text, but not quoted (Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 538).

348. "ὅσα νῦν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ τῇ ἐμῇ ἐλαχιστότητι ὡμολογήσω καὶ ὧν ἐπελάθου..."

349. "εὐχὴ ἐξομολογήσεως," (Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 540)

350. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ δίκαιος ὁ δι᾽ ἡμᾶς φορέσας . . . ," (Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 540).

soever you declared to my unworthiness . . . ."[351] Finally, also the "prayer of absolution for those who have confessed,"[352] which is attributed to Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos, "O Master Lord Jesus Christ our God, who pardoned through Nathan . . . ,"[353] expressly speaks concerning the remission of sins that have been confessed ("forgive all which my spiritual child confessed with a contrite heart before You to my mediocrity . . ."). [354] All these prayers are found in our various Euchologia in use and in manuscripts.

Secondly, in all the manuscripts and printed Euchologia, this prayer, which presupposes the presence of many individuals repenting, is written in a plural number ("by these your servants . . . as human beings bearing flesh and living in the world were beguiled by the Devil . . . they despised...they came...they fell under...they were bound . . . these your servants . . . their faults . . . deliver them . . ."). [355] And not only this, but also the prayer is written in such a way that it is presented as a common petition of many priests praying at the same time: "listen to our prayers...."[356] However, we know that confession and absolution take place from the earliest times in the Church privately by one priest and in the presence of one believer who has confessed by himself/herself.

Let us now look at when this prayer was said. In the printed Euchologia, it is characterized as a "prayer for those repenting."[357] But it is found in the service of confession as a first prayer, which is said before the sinner confesses his/her sins. Consequently, neither in

---

351. "ὅσα τῇ ἐμῇ ἐξεῖπας ἀναξιότητι," (Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 540)

352. "εὐχὴ συγχωρητικὴ ἐπὶ ἐξομολογουμένων," (Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 538).

353. "Δέσποτα Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ συγχωρήσας διὰ Νάθαν . . . ," (Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 538).

354. "συγχώρησον πάντα ὅσα ἐνώπιόν σου τῇ ἐμῇ ἐλαχιστότητι ἐξωμολογήσατο μετὰ συντετριμμένης καρδίας τὸ πνευματικόν μου τέκνον...," (Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 538).

355. "παρὰ τῶν δούλων σου τούτων . . . ὡς ἄνθρωποι σάρκα φοροῦντες καὶ τὸν κόσμον οἰκοῦντες ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐπλανήθησαν . . . κατεπάτησαν . . . ἐγένοντο . . . ὑπέπεσαν . . . ὑπήχθησαν . . . τούτους τοὺς δούλους σου . . . συγχωρῶν αὐτοίς...ὑπὲρ τῶν δούλων σου πάντων . . . τὰ πταίσματα αὐτῶν . . . ἀπάλλαξον αὐτούς . . . "

356. "ἐπάκουσον ἡμῶν δεομένων."

357. "εὐχὴ ἐπὶ μετανοούντων."

one nor the other case has it the character of a component prayer of the mystery of repentance, given that it is said before confession and the other special prayers of absolution follow it. Now, in the manuscripts, this prayer is often encountered; indeed, in one of them, it is attributed to Basileios the Great. In a great many, it is characterized as "a prayer of absolution for the one about to partake of the divine mysteries"[358] or "a prayer of partaking"[359] (*Patriarchate of Jerusalem 73*; *Patriarchate of Alexandria 371*; *Sinai 977, 978, 980, 986*; *Timiou Staurou 615*; *Vatopediou 134*; *Karakallou 163*, and so forth). But also, in many other manuscripts there exist other prayers that are said instead of this prayer, again "for those about to partake."[360] From all this, we conclude that there existed a very old custom for a prayer of absolution to be read for those faithful about to commune, either the specific prayer in question or another one.

Who read it? Again, our manuscripts state that it was read by the hierarch, the spiritual father, or the priest. This distinction means that, if a hierarch or spiritual father is not present, even a simple priest, who does not have the office of spiritual fatherhood, may irrespectively read the prayer in question. Indeed, most manuscripts do not make mention of a hierarch or spiritual father, but simply state: "A prayer, which the priest says" or "which is said by the priest over the head of the one about to partake of holy communion" or "which is said by a priest" and so forth.

And the conclusion is clear: The prayer "O Lord, Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, shepherd and lamb . . ." is a general prayer of absolution and is rightly said, according to ancient custom, to all the faithful that will commune, by the priest that will commune them whether he is a spiritual father or not. And it is very logical for the faithful who approach for holy communion to feel the need to request from their priest to pray for the forgiveness and remission of their sins in order that they might approach for communion more worthily, as well as also for the priest to pray for the forgiveness of the sins of the faithful about to approach for holy

358. "συγχωρητικὴ εὐχὴ ἐπὶ τὸν μέλλοντα μεταλαβεῖν τῶν θείων μυστηρίων."
359. "εὐχὴ μεταλήψεως."
360. "ἐπὶ τοὺς μέλλοντας μεταλαβεῖν."

communion. Now if some faithful are content with this prayer and it brings about for them the sense that they do not have a need for confession, neither they nor the prayer are responsible for this. The simplest but also the worse solution is that we abolish anything because it is a cause of certain misunderstandings or misinterpretations. A multitude of things in our divine worship, either from illiteracy or superstitions or unenlightened faith, have been misunderstood or associated with a myriad of preconceptions. Must we then abolish them for this reason or rather instruct our people—who are the ones least responsible for these matters— to worship correctly and to know the reason and the deeper meaning of what is celebrated in our Church?

## 54

### Is the prayer of vaskania[361] read for unbaptized children?

## 55

### Is an unbaptized deceased child buried in the graveyard or in countryside church?[362]

Unbaptized infants so long as they are born from Christian parents, who have the intention to baptize them, of course are not Christian inasmuch as they have not yet entered into the Christian community with holy baptism, nevertheless are members of the Church in some indirect way; we can say they are "catechumens."[363] No-

361. The term "vaskania" (βασκανία) is sometimes translated "evil eye," but can also be understood as a malignant influence or desire upon someone, or even a jealousy. It can thus be translated as "malignity." The Romanization of "βασκανία" is being rendered in its commonly known modern form, "vaskania" versus "baskania."

362. In Greece, public cemeteries are generally regarded as sacred grounds, often where a chapel is located, and interments in these graveyards are administered by the state and the Orthodox Church. The "τὰ ἐξωκκλήσια," countryside churches, are chapels or small temples located often "outside" (ἔξω) villages and towns, and frequently placed on property large enough (as implied by the question) to easily accommodate burials. See question 94 regarding the burial of those outside of the Orthodox Church in Greek public cemeteries.

363. Phountoulēs appears to be basing these thoughts on an extremely similar text of Symeōn of Thessaloniki, see Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon*

tice in the prayers that are read on the day of birth that there is a special mention and a special prayer concerning the child. Thus, in the first prayer[364] it states: "and preserve this infant born of her from every poisonous substance, from every hardship, from every storm of adversity, from evil spirits both of the day and of the night . . . from sickness and infirmity, from jealousy and envy, and from the eyes of vaskania[365] and have mercy on this baby . . . and make the infant born from her worthy to worship in the earthly temple . . . ." On the eighth day, the child is lead into the temple and "is sealed," his/her name is given, and the ancient prayer of the register of catechumens is read: "O Lord our God, we pray to you and beseech you, let the light be signed . . . ."[366] And the priest makes "a sign of the cross" with the newborn before the gates of the temple or the icon of the Theotokos. All the more so, during the service of the fortieth day, where the child "is churched," special prayers are read for it, who is already called from the eighth day onwards "a servant of God," and is brought into the temple and into the altar. Consequently, by analogy, it can also partake of other blessings and prayers of the Church, inasmuch as they do not have a character of a mystery. Moreover, the prayer of vaskania[367] is a type of exorcism and exorcisms were read and are read even today for catechumens. Besides, there is a special mention concerning vaskania, as we saw, in the second prayer that is read on the first day of the child's birth. Certainly, then, the prayer of the vaskania can be read also for unbaptized children.

Now, the burial of these infants does not take place according to ecclesiastical taxis since they are not Christians. Nevertheless, whether they are interred on the grounds of countryside churches, as is customary, or in the corner of the graveyard, where it is preferred for reasons of security, again in some way they are resting under the

---

*of Thessalonika,* 125.

364. These are the contents of the second prayer, which Phountoulēs discusses later in the response.

365. "ὀφθαλμῶν βασκανίας," namely, "eyes of malignity."

366. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, σοῦ δεόμεθα καὶ σὲ παρακαλοῦμεν, σημειωθήτω τὸ φῶς . . ."

367. "ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς βασκανίας."

protection and mercy of God, given that in both cases the burial is performed in ground dedicated to God.

## 56

### Is the eating of fish permitted on Palm Sunday?

The Saturday of Lazarus and Palm Sunday are found outside of the period of Great Lent, which concludes on the Friday before Palm Sunday, as the two familiar troparia that are chanted during the Vespers of this day distinctively state and also both begin with the same phrase, "Having completed the forty days that bring profit to our soul . . ."[368] (first stichēron and also at the "Both now"[369] of the "Lord, I have cried to you"[370]). But both these days also have a joyous and festive character, the Saturday being resurrectional and the Sunday a feast of the Lord; nevertheless, they are found within the framework of an entire period of fasting. As we know, on feasts of the Lord and of the Mother of God, even if they fall during the period of fasting, as for example, the Annunciation, or on fasting days of the week (Wednesday and Friday), a breaking of the fast takes place with fish. This precisely also takes place in the case of Palm Sunday. As a matter of fact, according to Theodōros the Stoudite, they also ate fish on the Saturday of Lazarus for the same reason (*Διδασκαλία χρονικὴ τῆς Μονῆς τοῦ Στουδίου*).[371] In addition, also, the monastic Typikon of Saint Sabas[372] and the Triōdion order a serving

368. "Τὴν ψυχωφελῆ πληρώσαντες τεσσαρακοστήν . . ."

369. "Καὶ νῦν."

370. "Κύριε ἐκέκραξα πρὸς σέ."

371. PG 99:1700b. Saint Theodōros the Stoudite (759–826) was a major monastic figure and opponent of iconoclasm to whom many works are attributed including extensive hymnography. The title of this work may be translated "Chronological Teaching of the Monastery of Stoudios." Modern scholarship generally does not regard the writing as a genuine work of Saint Theodōros, see Julien Leroy, *Études sur les Grandes Catéchèses de S. Théodore Studite*, Studi e Testi 456 (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2008), 71–72; and Roman Cholij, *Theodore the Stoudite: The Ordering of Holiness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 77.

372. In discussing the liturgical Typikon in general, the liturgical scholar Robert Taft states, "This type of typikon (τυπικόν) is one of two Byzantine liturgical books with rules governing the celebration of services: where the diataxis gives the rubrics regulating the ordinary structure of services, the typikon

of fish on the table of the monasteries on Palm Sunday ("and a great consolation takes place for the brethren; for we eat fish").[373]

Nevertheless, stricter monastic Typika forbid the breaking of the fast with fish on Palm Sunday and permit only a breaking of the fast with wine and oil, restricting the eating of fish only for the feast of the Annunciation. The Typikon of the Monastery of Stoudios, Patriarch Nikolaos of Constantinople in his verses to Anastasios the abbot of the monastery of Mount Sinai,[374] and the Typika of the

indicates what is proper to each day of the year. There are three types of liturgical typikon: the 'cathedral' Typikon of the Great Church for the rite of Hagia Sophia and other secular churches, and two 'monastic' forms, the Stoudite and Sabaitic Typika, which regulated services in monasteries," (Robert Taft, "Typikon," *ODB* 3:2131–2132). See also the brief discussion of the Typika by Phountoulēs at the beginning of questions 67 and 445. Saint Sabas (439–532), born in Cappadocia, travelled to Palestine and eventually established there the monastery of *Mar Saba*, the Great Lavra of Saint Sabas. On his life and monastic system, see Joseph Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism: A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, Fourth to the Seventh Centuries*, Dumbarton Oaks Studies 32 (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1995) and Joseph Patrich, "Palestinian Desert Monasticism: The Monastic Systems of Chariton, Gerasimos, and Sabas," *Cristianesimo nella storia* 16 (1995): 1–9. The Typikon and monastic system under his name exercised a wide influence throughout the Byzantine and Slavic worlds and continues to exert a major role in the Orthodox Church. For a general assessment of the influence of Sabaite monasticism and specific studies covering a wide range of subjects, see Joseph Patrich, ed., *The Sabaite Heritage in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to the Present*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 98 (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peters en Departement Oosterse Studies, 2001). The Typikon of Saint Sabas was published in various editions in 1545, 1577, 1603, 1615, 1643, 1685, 1691, 1738, 1771, and 2009. For a discussion of these editions as well as the text of the Typikon of Saint Sabas that will be referenced in the present work (outside of manuscript citations), see Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου, 2012).

373. "καὶ γίνεται μεγάλη παράκλησις τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς· ἐσθίομεν γὰρ ἰχθύας." Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου, 2012), 322.

374. Nikolaos III Grammatikos (r. 980–982) is attributed authorship of this Typikon written in verse, but the addressee varies in manuscript. Modern scholarship holds its addressee to be an abbot of Mount Athos. The title of the work is, *Νικολάου τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ποίημα πρὸς τὸν πρῶτον τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους ὡς τυπικόν* and its modern edition is found in J. Koder,

monasteries of the Holy Mountain order this. As an explanation of the prohibition of eating fish, it is put forward by these Typika the fact that while Palm Sunday has a triumphal character, at the same time it is also a forefeast of the Lord's holy passions. Blessed Nikodēmos the Hagiorite in his *Rudder* who also follows these Typika condemns the eating of fish on Palm Sunday and considers corresponding instructions[375] to be "innovations of heretics who are indulging the stomach."[376]

Nevertheless, as we saw, there also existed during the Byzantine era, even in these monasteries, dual traditions, the more flexible, which permitted the breaking of the fast with fish on the feast of Palm Sunday, and the more austere, which forbade it. Generally, nowadays in the world, the eating of fish has become prevalent, while the stricter Typikon has become prevalent on the Holy Mountain. From this dual practice, the familiar saying is also inspired, "blessed is he who shall eat and thrice-blessed is he who shall not eat"[377] fish on Palm Sunday. This simple, but wise saying, can also set the rule in our case. Inasmuch as the eating of fish has become prevalent and has its support in ancient practice, it is good that we do not impose "another burden" on the people, according to the reasonable apostolic policy (Acts 15:28, Rev 2:24), leaving the "heavier" for the more austere and more zealous.

---

"Das Fastengedicht des Patriarchen Nikolaos III, Grammatikos," *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 11 (1970): 203–241. The relevant verse (275) regarding fish is found on page 224 of this edition. For additional information on this writing in general, see *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarchat de Constantinople*, 982.

375. "διατάξεις."

376. "νεωτερίσματα αἱρετικῶν τῇ κοιλίᾳ χαριζομένων," is taken from Saint Nikodēmos's first footnote to his commentary on Apostolic canon 69. Ἁγάπιος ἱερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 92.

377. "μακάριος ποὺ θὰ φάγῃ καὶ τρὶς μακάριος ποὺ δὲν θὰ φάγῃ."

## 57

**On the Saturdays of Souls and during memorial services, it is customary in some parishes for hypsōmon (ὕψωμον)[378] to be given to the relatives of the deceased, who offered the prosphoro.[379] Is this correct or must hypsōmon only be given in Liturgies that take place on behalf of the living?**

The offering of hypsōmon to the relatives of the deceased, who held the Divine Liturgy for the repose of the soul of their beloved who has "fallen asleep," is customary in many places. But it must not, I think, be viewed as something uncanonical. That which has meaning is the offering of a portion for the deceased during the proskomidē, which is also the purpose of offering the prosphoro. Inasmuch as this has taken place, the purpose of the offering has been fulfilled. The hypsōmon is simply a selected portion from the remainders of the prosphoro, which is given as antidōron to those who offered it. Naturally, since the living offered it for both their own and their relatives' blessing and sanctification, this portion of the blessed and sanctified bread is offered back in return to them. Furthermore, both in the proskomidē and the Liturgy, not only those for whom the offering took place, but also those who offered it, are always remembered, whether by name or also generally. The prayer of the prothesis states, "God, our God . . . as good and lover of humankind remember those who have offered and those for whom they offered,"[380] as also the prayer of the anaphora of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, "Remember, O Lord, those who offered you these gifts, for whom and by whom and on behalf of whom they were offered."[381]

The Divine Liturgy, whether it is offered especially for one or more persons living or who have "fallen asleep," does not cease to be the offering of all faithful present and absent, of the local church,

---

378. Phountoulēs spells this word in the nominative case as "τὸ ὕψωμο" and "τὸ ὕψωμον," namely, with and without the "ν" ending.

379. "τὸ πρόσφορο."

380. "Ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . . μνημόνευσον ὡς ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος τῶν προσενεγκάντων καὶ δι' οὓς προσήγαγον."

381. "Μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τῶν τὰ δῶρά σοι ταῦτα προσκομισάντων καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν καὶ δι' ὧν καὶ ἐφ' οἷς αὐτὰ προσεκόμισαν."

but also of the entire ecumene. And by it, in one way or another, all are sanctified; much more those for whom especially the bloodless sacrifice takes place and those who offer the gifts on their behalf. And one of the ways for participating in this sanctification is the consumption of the sanctified hypsōmon, which is given honorably for this purpose by the priest to those who offered the gifts either for their living or deceased.

## 58

**The elevated bread of the proskomidē is given as antidōron and does not leave the temple. However, during daily Liturgies, where many Christians are not present, what must be done with the remainders of the prosphora (τῆς προσφορᾶς)?**

The bread that is elevated in the proskomidē "in remembrance of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ," from which the lamb is excised, is considered sanctified precisely on account of this offering. As characteristically Nikolaos Kabasilas[382] states in the *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy* which he wrote, the bread being offered in the proskomidē became "holy" "by being offered and dedicated to God."[383] Symeōn of Thessaloniki also writes the same thing in a more detailed way: "For this bread is also blessed and sealed with the

382. Nikolaos Chamaetos Kabasilas (Νικόλαος Χαμαετὸς Καβάσιλας) (b. ca. 1320–1324, d. after 1391) lived in Thessaloniki as a theologian. His writings on the Liturgy continue to exercise a major influence on Orthodox liturgical thought. The Sources Chrétiennes edition will be used for a text of his liturgical commentary, *Ἑρμηνεία τῆς Θείας Λειτουργίας (Explanation of the Divine Liturgy)*. The paragraph numbers of Kabasilas's work will be given consistent with the Sources Chrétiennes edition, which differs from those cited by Phountoulēs. For an English translation, see J. M. Hussey and P. A. McNulty, trans., *Nicholas Cabasilas, A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy* (St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1977). For an assessment of his work, see Ἀθανάσιος Ἀ. Ἀγγελόπουλος, *Νικόλαος Χαμαετὸς Καβάσιλας, Ἡ ζωὴ καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελέτων, 1970) and René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 215–244.

383. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 53.4 in *Nicholas Cabasilas: Explication de la Divine Liturgie*, eds. René Bornert, Jean Gouillard, and Pierre Périchon, and trans. Sévérien Salaville, 2nd ed., SC 4bis (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1967), 304–305.

sign of the cross by the lance and has received sacred words, but it is not communion of the Body of Christ. Those are the mysteries; this is only the distribution of blessing and the providing of a divine gift, which derive from the words in the prothesis" (*Dialogue*, chapter 100, *Explanation*, 101).[384] But since the lamb is excised from this bread, it was considered also a symbol "of the virginal body" of the Theotokos (Theodōros of Andida, *Summary Commentary*.[385] Germanos, *Mystical Contemplation*[386]) and, for this reason, a provider of

384. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 263, 157.

385. Theodōros of Andida (twelfth century) is little known except for the work, *Προθεωρία κεφαλαιώδης περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ λειτουργίᾳ γινομένων συμβόλων καὶ μυστηρίων πονηθεῖσα ἐκ προτροπῆς καὶ ἀξιώσεως τοῦ Θεοφιλεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Φυτείας Βασιλείου* (*Summary Commentary concerning the symbols and mysteries occurring in the Divine Liturgy, composed at the behest and request of His Eminence Basileios, bishop of Phyteia*)(PG 140:417–468). According to René Bornert, the *Προθεωρία* is the earlier writing of Nikolaos of Andida, which was revised and abridged by Theodōros, who may have been a later successor to the same episcopal see. Bornert dates the original work of Nikolaos between 1055–1063. J. Darrouzès disagrees with Bornert and dates the work before 1100, most likely between 1085–1095. For this discussion, see René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 181–206, and J. Darrouzès, "Nicolas d'Andida et les azyme," *Revue des études byzantines* 32 (1974): 199–203. For a theological analysis of the work, see Hans-Joachim Schulz, *The Byzantine Liturgy* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1986), 89–99. Additional studies include Roland Betancourt, "A Byzantine Liturgical Commentary in Verse: Introduction and Translation," *OCP* 81 (2015): 433–472 and Barbara Crostini, "Interpreting the Interpreters: The Principles and Aims of the Protheoria," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 42 (1993): 51–59. The translation of the terms "Προθεωρία κεφαλαιώδης" as "Summary Commentary" is based on Betancourt's study, who has written overviews of Nikolaos and Theodōros of Andida for a forthcoming work, Michael Grünbart and Alexander Riehle, eds., *Lexikon byzantinischer Autoren* (Leipzig: Akademie Verlag). Cited 4 December 2019. Online at: https://www.academia.edu/1863449/Entries_for_Nikolaos_von_Andida_and_Theodoros_von_Andida_

386. Saint Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople (r. 715–730), is attributed authorship of a commentary on the Liturgy entitled, *Ἱστορία Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ καὶ Μυστικὴ Θεωρία (Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation)*, a work of synthesis, major influence, and importance. For a discussion of authorship and an important study, see René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 125–180. For its modern translation and an introduction, see Paul Meyendorff, trans., *St. Germanus of Constantinople, On the Divine Liturgy* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984). For a detailed exam-

special blessing. Earlier, as shown from the words of Kabasilas and Symeōn that we mentioned, a special blessing was not given to the cut prosphora after the consecration of the precious gifts, as takes place nowadays, but only its offering in the prothesis, and the entire rite of the proskomidē gave the blessing to it.

Thus, then, consistent with these things, the bread by which the proskomidē took place, whether it be blessed as antidōron or not, must no longer be considered common bread. And if the congregation is large, it will be consumed by it as antidōron. However, if the ones present are few, the priest must make sure it is cut into larger pieces or, if even in this manner again excess remains, he himself must consume it after finishing the holy elements or must distribute it to the children who serve him in the altar, as also took place in the ancient church with the remainder of the Holy Eucharist. If he is going to again serve the Liturgy in the same temple on the following or a nearby day, he may keep it in a secure place and distribute it during the next Liturgy. In any case, on the Holy Mountain and in the Slavic churches, they use small prosphora, proportionate with the numbers of the congregation. Thus, the possibility that excesses remain does not ever present itself.

Perhaps this concern regarding the leftover antidōron might be viewed as excessive. In any case, I would view it as very praiseworthy and as an example of care and piety, even a spirit of tidiness by the priest. Trays or baskets with crumbs and blessed loaves left in the holy bēma and on the candle counter,[387] at the mercy of anyone as well as insects and mice, neither is pious nor demonstrates culture and interest regarding the decorum and cleanliness of the Lord's house.

---

ination of the work's significance, see Robert Taft, "The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm," *DOP* 34–35 (1980–1981): 45–75.

387. "στὸ παγκάρι."

## 59

**In the absence of a hierarch, can the priest read at the end of the funeral the two prayers of absolution that refer to any curse and interdict, or not?**

To be sure, this concerns the two prayers that are contained in our Euchologia: "O Lord our God, who by your unutterable wisdom have fashioned humanity out of the dust . . ."[388] and "O most merciful Master Lord Jesus Christ our God, who to Peter the chief of your disciples and apostles . . . ."[389] As the rubric expressly states that precedes in manuscripts and printed Euchologia, these are read in a special Liturgy on behalf of the repose of the soul of the deceased and during the service of the proskomidē by all priests who are going to concelebrate, and during the great entrance by the hierarch himself, who, while the priests hold the holy gifts, "upon bended knee, he pronounces them in a loud voice with compunction and tears, and upon rising after their completion receives the holy gifts." Still in other Euchologia, it is stated that these prayers "ought to be read by a hierarch." But also, even the content of these prayers reveals that this also clearly concerns hierarchical prayers. Thus, near the end of the first and at the beginning of the second, there is a reference to the authority "to bind and loose," which was given by the Lord to Peter the chief of the apostles and to his successors,[390] namely, to hierarchs, one of whom is he who reads the prayer, as clearly stated by the first ("and through him also granted to us sinners this authority") and the second prayer ("who by your unutterable love for humankind, deemed us to become lowly and unworthy successors of the authority given to him, so that we might also so bind or loose what comes to pass among your people"). Apart from these, there is also a reference in the two prayers concerning remission and loosing "of the heavy interdict"[391] that was imposed by a hierarch, which is

388. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τῇ σῇ ἀρρήτῳ σοφίᾳ δημιουργήσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ τοῦ χοός . . ."

389. "Δέσποτα πολυέλεε, Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τῷ κορυφαίῳ τῶν σῶν μαθητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων Πέτρῳ . . ."

390. Matt 16:19.

391. "βαρυτάτου ἀφορισμοῦ."

loosed, according to what is observed in the Church, only by his successor or, if necessary, also by another hierarch.

From these reasons, it became clear that these two prayers of absolution "for every curse and interdict"[392] are not said by a priest, but only by the hierarch. Nevertheless, there is a note that precedes these prayers, consistent with which they can be read "in necessity by the spiritual father, if a hierarch is not present." On the basis of this rubric, these prayers are sometimes read by oikonomia also by priests. However, three requirements must apply that permit an exception, namely: a necessity exists, a hierarch is not present, and the priest has spiritual fatherhood. These points concern the first part of the question, namely, concerning whether it is permitted for these two prayers of absolution to be read by a priest.

Now as for the time of their reading, from the outset it must be made clear that they have no place in the funeral service. As seen in the standard rubric that we referenced at the beginning, these two prayers are said at requiem Liturgies,[393] or generally at memorial services, and not at funerals. From the allusions that we have ("the body be broken into the elements from which it was composed . . . the body be dissolved into the elements from which it was composed . . . and dissolve the body into the elements from which it was composed . . . he/she incurred a bond unreleased...loosen your servant who has 'fallen asleep' from spiritual and bodily sin," first prayer, "loosen him/her also from the bond placed upon him/her in whatever manner . . . the body be given back to nature which was created by you," second prayer), it is also clear that the two prayers have in view the decomposition of the body, which was found, or a fear exists that it be found, undecomposed during the exhumation, precisely on account of interdict or other weighty sins, from which forgiveness is sought by these prayers.[394] Consequently, time surely

392. "εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρὰν καὶ ἀφορισμόν."

393. "ἐπιμνημόσυνες λειτουργίες."

394. In Greece, it is common for exhumation to take place for the reuse of gravesites. On the amount of time necessary for exhumation to take place, Phountoulēs states in question 97, "But since the view prevailed in the past, as it also does up until now, that the body's incomplete decomposition 'into its constituent parts' is a result of the gravest sins or of excommunication and

has intervened, and certainly a sufficient amount, from when the sinful person died. Regarding the funeral service, only the small, but ancient and beautiful prayer "O God of spirits and all flesh . . ."[395] is provided, which itself also has a character of absolution, since forgiveness of every sin of the one previously "fallen asleep" is sought, in which he/she fell "by thought, word, and deed." The addition of other prayers both constitutes an excess and is not consistent with the standard rubric, the aim, and the content of the two prayers of absolution.

## 60

**How many days must Christians fast before holy communion? Can they commune without fasting?**

In order for the believer to participate worthily as possible in the communion of the Lord's Body and Blood, certainly special preparation is required. The Apostle Paul (1 Cor 11:27–32) points out the consequences of an unworthy approach to the table of the Lord. To this are owed sicknesses, death, and other chastening, which come from the Lord to people that unworthily commune. "For the one

---

generally was viewed as something terrible and sinister, it was judged good for the interment to be extended as long as possible for reasons of security, so that the decomposition of the body would be presumably ensured." These beliefs regarding the decomposition of the body and exhumation are reflected in a recent study of rural culture in Greece, Loring M. Danforth, *The Death Rituals of Rural Greece* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982), 50:

> Partial decomposition, and the unfortunate fate of the soul to which it attests, may be attributed to several factors. These same factors are also held responsible for the slow separation of the soul from the body at death. In both cases the proper transition from life to death has been blocked by a lack of harmony in the social relationships that the deceased enjoyed with other members of his community. The corpse may have failed to decompose fully because the deceased himself or one of his ancestors committed a sin that was not forgiven. It is also said that if proper burial rites were not performed, if the deceased was excommunicated by the Orthodox Church, or if he was cursed by someone, his body will not decompose. Curses such as 'May the earth not receive you' (*Na mi se dhehti i yis*) and 'May you remain undecomposed' (*Na minis aliotos*) express the wish that the passage from life to death not occur properly. They are the exact antithesis of the prayers for forgiveness and for the decomposition of the body that are frequently heard at funeral and burial services.

395. "Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός . . ."

who eats and drinks without discerning the Body eats and drinks judgment upon himself."[396] He recommends that the one about to commune prepare himself/herself first and afterwards approach: "Let a man examine himself, and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup . . . but if we judged ourselves truly, we should not be judged."[397] What was the "examination" and this "judgment"? The Apostle does not tell us. But from the practice of the Church of that period certainly it appears that it was a life in fear of God, deep faith and devotion to the mystery, reconciliation and mutual forgiveness, and the examination of the conscience concerning all these things. Namely, this is what with three words the Church also nowadays looks for from the one approaching, when saying, "With fear of God, faith, and love, draw near."[398] Fasting was not considered a condition for holy communion. The Divine Liturgy was celebrated in the evening during the common meals, the "agapes," since previously all had participated in the common table. In other words, they precisely repeated the practice of the Lord, who established the mystery "after supper"[399] in the upper room of Holy Sion. Afterwards, for reasons of piety, the Divine Liturgy was separated from the meals and took place in the morning. At that time, the custom also began slowly to appear of abstinence from all food, from midnight until the time of communion. This was and is, up until now, the official and prescribed fast, the one preparatory for the Holy Eucharist. This is the fast and the abstinence, which the faithful practice while awaiting the Bridegroom of their souls and which is combined with prayer, self-reflection, and spiritual and physical purification. When the Divine Liturgy was celebrated during the afternoon, as on the days of Great Lent (Presanctifieds) or on the eves of the Nativity and of Theophany and on Great Saturday, the fast was extended from midnight until the afternoon, namely, the time of communion. Only on Great Thursday was the ancient practice observed and the faithful communed during the afternoon without fasting throughout the entire

396. 1 Cor 11:29.
397. 1 Cor 11:28, 31.
398. "Μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ, πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης προσέλθετε."
399. Luke 22:20, 1 Cor 11:25.

day. Many canons enforce this "Eucharistic fast," such as canon forty-one of the Council in Carthage ("That the holy elements of the altar shall not be performed except by fasting men, with the exception of a single day in the year on which the Lord's supper is celebrated,"[400] namely, Great Thursday), canon forty-seven of the same Council (". . . that Holy Things are offered by those fasting, as is becoming"),[401] canon twenty-nine of the Penthektē Ecumenical Council,[402] and canon nine of Saint Nikēphoros of Constantinople.[403] Certainly, also, Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos means this, when stating: "being about to draw near to this fearful and divine table and the sacred mystagogy, do this with fear and trembling, with a pure conscience, with fasting and prayer" (*Homily on the Day of the Birth*).[404]

Multiday fasting, namely, xerophagy, and certainly not the complete abstinence from food, as preparatory for holy communion, was unknown in the ancient church. The most characteristic proof is the Liturgy of Sunday. The celebration of the Liturgy presupposes that the faithful will commune. Nevertheless, how would they commune if fasting before communion was obligatory, since fasting on Saturday, only aside from Great Saturday, is forbidden with severe penances by the sacred canons (Holy Apostles sixty-six, Penthektē fifty-five)?[405] The same thing is also the case during Renewal Week, during which canon sixty-six of the Penthektē Council decrees that Christians "delight in" the holy mysteries daily, while throughout all these days the breaking of fasting takes place "entirely."[406]

Nevertheless, since fasting is considered by our Church as an excellent means of preparation, purification, and readying of the faithful, concerning this it recommends to the faithful who com-

400. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 3:405 (also listed as canon forty-eight).
401. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 3:416.
402. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:367.
403. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 4:428.
404. Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos, *In diem natalem D.N. Jesu Christi* 7 (PG 49:360). The title of the homily is "Εἰς τὴν γενέλθιον ἡμέραν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἄδηλον μὲν ἔτι οὖσαν τότε, πρό δε ὀλίγων ἐτῶν γνωρισθεῖσαν παρά τινων τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Δύσεως ἐλθόντων καὶ ἀναγγειλάντων."
405. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:84, 434.
406. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:460.

mune infrequently either to approach for holy communion after the appointed ecclesiastical fasts (Great Lent, Holy Apostles, Dormition, Nativity), or to observe, according to their ability, more or less three days fasting before holy communion. This subject lies within the discretion of the enlightened spiritual father, who knows the depths of the hearts and the life circumstances of his spiritual children. He shall prescribe, if he judges necessary, both preparation through fasting as well as its duration.

The entirely inviolable fast before holy communion is, we repeat, the complete abstinence from food from midnight, which may not be observed only in a case of danger of death, according to canon nine of Saint Nikēphoros of Constantinople ("It is necessary to administer holy communion to the sick one, who is in danger of dying, even after having eaten food").[407]

## 61

**Should the zōnē of the sacred vestments be given to the future spouses?**

He who writes these words does not have the idea that he is infallible. When more than a year ago he undertook to respond to the inquiries of priests, which chiefly related to liturgical topics, he surmised from the few questions that he had before him that many of them would place him in a difficult position and that the answer to all could not always be unequivocal. Besides, this is why after first speaking he sought to also hear the perhaps different opinions of his readers and to discuss again with them their possible objections. Our common aim is to find what is correct and the truth while searching the plain sources of our Church's faith and practice, and avoiding the reefs of confusion and the obscurity of ignorance. Now he has a bulky file of letters before him, in which he can count the questions that exceed the number of those, to which, as far as possible, answers have been given. And most of them are related to difficult topics, to real "difficulties." Some of these refer back to older questions and put forward

407. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 4:428.

objections to answers that have already been published. Two of them concern the subject of the response to question thirty-four.

One is the letter of the very reverend archimandrite G. Paraskevopoulos, which is published below.[408] Another of the reverend presbyter Ev. Theriakēs with great politeness calls into question the response of the one writing on the same query and explains the reasons. The priest who at that time submitted the question regarding whether the zōnē of the sacred vestments ought to be given at betrothals and weddings did not exactly say what this custom consisted of, and the one writing assumed that it is much like "ξεφόρεμα" (xephorema),[409] which is done for the sick after the Divine Liturgy. He considered only how there was in it "a clear or hidden inclination towards magic." The new letters indicated that it was something more serious. Indeed, it is not in keeping with the purpose or with the sanctity of the sacred vestments, for one of them, the zōnē in question, to be given in order for newlyweds to wear it as an "apotropaion"[410] from demonic influences. The letter writers are right; neither the zōnē nor the substitute for the zōnē ought to be given in similar cases.

Nevertheless, in truth, we should say two things. First, that these superstitious Christians are not performing magic with the sacred vestment but are attempting with a sacred means to ward off the influences of sorcery and the devil. Does not the Church also do the same thing formally with the exorcism prayers, with prayers for the vaskania, with Saint Tryphōn, with the crucifixion of passions through the holy lance, and unofficially with flowers, phylacteries, pieces of cotton that come into contact with holy relics, sanctified waters, the linens of a church's consecration, and so forth? Most times, the individuals that request these things and use them are more pious than us who perhaps do not request them, despite the fact that their piety and its manners of expression are folkish, simple,

408. Author's footnote: "See *Ὁ Ἐφημέριος* 15 (1966): 1017–19."

409. This refers to a practice whereby the celebrant, while removing his vestments after the Divine Liturgy, places them on the heads of the sick at their request for God's healing. Generally, this takes place at the north door of the iconostasis.

410. An amulet to ward off evil.

innocent, and perhaps sometimes, much less authentically Christian. We all know the infinite number of such practices and customs. I have before me a recent book of the professor G. Megas with the title, *Greek Celebrations and Customs of Popular Religion*, which in its 250 pages enumerates thousands of similar expressions.[411] Some of them are pre-Christian inheritances, others despicable, others tolerable, others pious, however all manifest the deep penetration of Christianity into the piety of our people. And these apparently pagan things have taken a new Christian clothing. The catharsis is not done with excommunications and anathemas, but will be the result of the lengthy, intensive, and serious enlightenment of our people, who when cultivated spiritually will find in a true Christian spirit the answer to their fears and superstitions.

Secondly, canon seventy-three of the Holy Apostles, does not threaten with the punishment of excommunication the simple faithful who request the zōnē and wear it a few hours in order to ward off "spells" and return it, but those who appropriate "for personal use" sacred vessels and vestments.[412] Namely, as also canon ten of

411. Γεώργιος Μέγας, *Ἑλληνικὲς γιορτὲς καὶ ἔθιμα τῆς λαϊκῆς λατρείας* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1956).

412. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:93. Here, a translation of the canon and the major commentaries may be helpful:

Let no one appropriate for personal use a consecrated gold or silver vessel, or linen, for this is unlawful. But if anyone might be discovered doing this, let him be subject to excommunication.

ZŌNARAS. Things dedicated to God must not be made secular property; for they are consecrated; whether it is any vessel or woven fabric whatever (for by linen, all fabric is meant), or even it might be oil or beeswax. For the offering of these things to the temple of God consecrates them; therefore, beeswax or oil must not be taken away from the Church, nor any vessel, but neither fabric dedicated to God, and any of these things taken for personal use; for on account of this, are they subject to excommunication. But Achar purloined neither what had been offered to God or hallowed, but only what was promised; however, he also suffered punishment, being stoned to death with his whole family [Joshua 7:1-26].

BALSAMŌN. The present canon also prescribes the same things as canon 72, as regards to not making the things offered to God secular property and any vessel or furnishings whatsoever consecrated in temples; for by the name of linen, all fabric is meant. But that Achar who appropriated for himself a golden ingot from the gold spoils promised to God, and not yet offered, was

the First-Second Council[413] clarifies this canon, it threatens with the punishment of excommunication those who take the sacred chalices, patens, and other vessels and vestments and use them "for their own use" and "for personal gain," appropriate them, and defile them "in unholy use," and those who misappropriate vestments of the holy table or of the priest and wear them "for their own garment."

Certainly, these things do not justify the wearing of the sacred zōnē even for deterrent purposes, even for a short time by the faithful. The zōnē is intended to be worn by the priest, and only by him, during the Divine Liturgy. Its other use is incompatible with its intention and improper. The priest ought to have the courage to refuse providing it, after in a fitting manner he first enlightens the faithful appropriately.

## 62

**During the reading of the sacred gospel, many women have the habit of purchasing and lighting tapers.[414] Since this causes a commotion, do you think that this ought to be stopped?**

At various sacred points of divine worship, the faithful, and especially women, are indeed accustomed to light tapers on the candelabra or to hold burning tapers. In many places, this takes place during the "More honorable . . ."[415] in Matins and during the gospel reading and the cheroubikon of the Divine Liturgy. No one can dispute that this becomes a cause of disturbance in the congregation and that it disrupts the concentration of those attending church. The traffic from the candle counter to the candelabra, the lighting of the tapers,

---

stoned to death with his whole family. Also read canon 10 of the First and Second Council in the temple of the Holy Apostles.

ARISTĒNOS. The one who appropriates sacred vessels for personal use is excommunicated.

The one who appropriates sacred objects for personal use, a vessel or linen, which has been consecrated, shall be excommunicated as committing a crime.

413. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:682–683.

414. In this particular answer, the distinction is being made between slender candles, namely, a taper (κηρίον, τό), and larger ones (λαμπάς, ἡ, or λαμπάδα, ἡ).

415 "Τὴν τιμιωτέραν . . ."

the return again of each one to his place certainly contribute very little to the concentration that these sacred points of divine worship prescribe. This becomes more evident during the time of the reading of the gospel, to which also the one asking the question is referring, when those who are late in the lighting of their taper hinder with their activity the hearing of the divine words.

I know some priests who routinely aimed at and partially succeeded in limiting this disorder. But the lighting of the taper, especially according to the gospel, constitutes a custom deeply rooted within the Christian people. It appears to be very ancient and does not take place without cause. Outside of the fact that the lighting of the taper constitutes honor for the Savior who speaks through the gospel, it also symbolizes the light of Christ, who through the gospel shines in our hearts according to the allusion of the prayer that is said before the gospel: "Shine in our hearts, O Master who loves humankind, the pure light of your divine knowledge . . . ,"[416] or according to the phrase, "The Light of Christ illumines all,"[417] which is said between the two readings of the Liturgy of the Presanctified. Illumination that also spreads to the congregation always accompanied the reading of the sacred gospel. I do not know how easily a custom so ancient can be eradicated. The disorder could in any case be limited when the lighting of the taper takes place before the readings at the time of the chanting of the trisagion with suitable piety and attention, so that order is disturbed minimally, and the reading of the sacred texts is not disrupted.

Let us also not forget this, that the Christians who are present during sacred services are not inanimate objects or statues. Their active participation in divine worship compels them to chant along, to change positions, to shift, to participate in processions, and to come forward for holy communion, for the kissing of the cross or of the Gospel book, for anointing with unction, for the distribution of the palms, of flowers, etc., and so forth. When with continuous and routine admonition our faithful come to the point that they conduct

416. "Ἔλλαμψον ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, φιλάνθρωπε Δέσποτα, τὸ τῆς σῆς θεογνωσίας ἀκήρατον φῶς . . ."

417. "Φῶς Χριστοῦ φαίνει πᾶσι."

themselves in the temple and fulfill their duties in a civilized manner and with due piety and constraint, things will be much improved, and our divine worship will considerably approach its ideal form and order.[418]

## 63

**Some of the congregation, especially the women, kiss the icons during the time of the Divine Liturgy, cause a disturbance, and dirty the steps of the templon. Is it permitted to stop them appropriately?**

The portable icons of the sacred temple, whether they are found located on the templon or on the proskynētaria, are precisely placed in such a position that their kissing by the faithful is possible. Recall also from the history of iconoclasm how much tumult took place among pious people, when the suspension of the icons to higher places was ordered so that the faithful could not kiss them. In principle, therefore, we cannot prevent Christians from conferring also with a kiss the honor that is owed to sacred icons, even if they dirty the steps of the templon with their feet. The temple provides the especially employed person for the cleaning of the floor, who is indeed compensated from the mites[419] of the faithful. It is unnecessary for me to write that reasons of decorum and cleanliness also require the frequent cleaning of the glass of the sacred icons from the soiling of the kisses, not only after the end of sacred services, but also during them at frequent intervals.[420]

Nevertheless, it is a fact that this kissing causes much disorder in the sacred synaxes when every faithful person coming in at any point whatsoever of the service attempts to kiss all the sacred icons while indifferent whether, in this manner, it becomes a cause of creating a

418. In Greece, it is often observed that the conduct of faithful at vigils for feasts is significantly more orderly than for regular daytime celebrations. This may be related to the subset of the faithful that such vigils normally attract or due to the fact that the darkened temple during such celebrations inhibits social interaction during sacred services.

419. "τοὺς ὀβολούς," cf. Mark 12:41–44, Luke 21:1–4, although not the exact word used in the Scriptural texts ("λεπτὰ δύο").

420. For example, lipstick stains are often observed.

disturbance or the attention of those attending church is distracted from the celebrations. Precisely for this reason, the proskynētaria in many temples are placed near the entrance so that the one entering lights his/her taper and kisses the icon, which is exposed for veneration, directly at his/her entrance into the temple, without disturbing the rest of the congregation and while quietly taking his/her place in the temple.

However, the bad thing is that not all our Christians have the requisite manners so that they would behave with discretion at the most sacred time of divine worship. In monasteries, veneration is done during the lauds of Matins and the koinōnikon of the Divine Liturgy, but with absolute order, so much so that this kissing becomes one of the most beautiful and most solemn parts of the service. Nevertheless, inasmuch as these conditions cannot exist in parish temples, the only solution is for the priest in a paternal manner to set forth the reasons that necessitate those entering to confine their venerations to the icon of the proskynētarion and to delay their expression of piety for the remaining icons until after the end of the service or during the distribution of the antidōron, as occurs in many places, as long as this admonition is not done by the priest at the time of the service when it would become a cause of more disorder and potentially many misunderstandings.

In any case, experience has shown that the placing of the proskynētarion near the entrance of the temple decreases commotion by far and represents a halfway solution of this problem.

## 64

**When, how many times, and in what areas of the body should the priest anoint the faithful during the service of unction?**

On these subjects there does not exist agreement either in the manuscripts, in other sources, nor in the practice of various local churches.

And firstly, regarding the time of anointing, some manuscripts place it after the sanctification prayer of the oil, "O You who are without beginning, everlasting, holy of holies . . . ."[421] At that time,

421. "Ἄναρχε, ἀδιάδοχε, ἅγιε ἁγίων . . ."

all the priests anointed the sick in their turn saying the prayer, "O Holy Father, physician of our souls and bodies . . . ."[422] According to Symeōn of Thessaloniki, the anointing took place after the prayer, "O Holy Father . . . ," while at each anointing each one of the priests said, "'Our help is in the name of the Lord [who made the heavens and earth]'[423]" (*Dialogue*, chapter 290),[424] a thing that is attested to also by quite a few manuscripts. In still other manuscripts, the priest said during the anointing, "Hear me, O Lord; hear me, O Master; hear me, O Holy one,"[425] or said the troparion, "Lord, who has given us your cross as a weapon against the devil . . . ."[426] Other manuscripts place the anointing at seven different points of the service, namely, after the seven prayers that accompany the seven sets of readings. Finally, others place it at the end of the service.

Secondly, regarding how many times the anointing took place, the prevalent practice appears that it was to take place seven times, namely, one time by each one of the priests who celebrated the unction. Symeōn of Thessaloniki and many manuscripts attest to this. It appears that this originated from the relevant passage of the letter of Saint James (Iakōvos) where not only are many priests present to be called upon and to celebrate the mystery, but also many are present to anoint the sick ("anointing him with oil," Jas 5:14). Nevertheless, formerly, before the service of unction developed into the present long service, it appears that one sole anointing took place after the consecration prayers.

Regarding the areas of the body that should be anointed, again the same things apply. The *Codex Barberini*, which is the oldest Byzantine Euchologion in manuscript that survived, mentions three parts: the forehead, ears, and hands.[427] Symeōn of Thessaloniki pre-

422. "Πάτερ ἅγιε, ἰατρὲ τῶν ψυχῶν καὶ τῶν σωμάτων ἡμῶν . . ."

423. "'Η βοήθεια ἡμῶν ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου (τοῦ ποιήσαντος τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν)."

424. PG 155:528b–528c.

425. "Εἰσάκουσόν μου, Κύριε· εἰσάκουσόν μου, Δέσποτα· εἰσάκουσον μου, Ἅγιε."

426. "Κύριε, ὅπλον κατὰ τοῦ διαβόλου τὸν σταυρόν σου ἡμῖν δέδωκας . . ."

427. Such rubrics do not appear to exist in the rite described by the *Codex Barberini*, see Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*, Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80,

scribes as points of anointing: the forehead "on account of inner thoughts" or in order that the mind be sanctified, the face "on account of the senses," and the hands in order to be cleansed from "evil actions."[428] Other manuscripts simply mention "the head," others the forehead, beard,[429] cheeks, and hands. Other writers add "the eyes, ears, mouth, and feet," while other manuscripts extend the anointing to the entire body; the sick one is anointed by the priests "from feet till head."

But the anointing was not confined only to the sick. After the end of the service, the priests anointed in the shape of a cross not only all those present, but also the complete household of the one celebrating the unction, "every door, window, lintel, entrance, and pillar, until the kitchen and barn, if there is one."

In the wake of such a confused and diverse liturgical tradition, we easily appreciate the reason for which the diversity is owed, and nowadays is prevalent among priests, depending on the local traditions that each one of them follows. Thus, the anointing nowadays is found both after the sanctification of the oil and at the end of the service, and by all the priests and by one alone, and seven times and one only, and during the reciting of the prayers, "O Holy Father . . . " and other prayers (such as, "For healing of soul and body"[430] which I heard being said by an old-time priest), finally also on the forehead alone and on other areas of the body. In any case, the prevalent practice, and perhaps the most correct historically, is for the forehead, chin,[431] both cheeks, and both hands, inside the palm and on their outer part, to be anointed in the shape of a cross.

The only thing that anyone can recommend when faced with this diversity which the service of unction exhibits on these points is that priests piously follow their respective local traditions, applying

---

2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 196.1–200.2. The same observation is made by Paul Meyendorff, *The Anointing of the Sick* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2005), 41–42.

428. PG 155:528b.

429. "πώγων, ὁ." In its ancient usage, the word means "beard," but in modern Greek, it can also be understood as "chin."

430. "Εἰς ἴασιν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος."

431. "σιαγών."

with strictness the tradition which they received and has been observed for centuries in their local church.

## 65

**In certain regions a custom exists that together with the wine of the common cup the priests also offer to newlyweds pieces of prosphoro immersed in the common cup. Is this correct?**

The service of marriage was formerly celebrated associated with the Divine Liturgy of the Sacred Chrysostomos or with the Liturgy of the Presanctified, during which the newlyweds communed. The remnants of this association can be seen to this day: The Lord's prayer and the koinōnikon, "I will take the cup of salvation . . . ."[432] For many reasons in subsequent times, marriage ceased being celebrated with the Divine Liturgy and, thus, formed an independent service.

The common cup that is offered nowadays to newlyweds was offered also at that time after holy communion, which often—as it appears from the codices, when the Presanctified was celebrated—was given to them only under the species of Sanctified Bread, namely, of the Precious Body. When the newlyweds ceased communing, the common cup remained as a remembrance of that former practice. At that time, as some manuscripts again witness, a piece of bread was offered to the newlyweds apart also from the common cup, precisely like a remembrance of the communion of the Precious Body. Indeed, in some manuscripts, the imitation of holy communion is more pronounced. The priest, after "Peace be to all. Let us bow our heads to the Lord,"[433] went into the holy bēma, cut three pieces of bread, and placed them in the cup of wine. He said, "Let us attend, the Holy Things are for the holy,"[434] the people chanted "One is holy"[435] and the koinōnikon "I will take the cup of salvation . . . ." The priest said within the bēma the prayer over the cup, "O God, Pantokratōr, who created all things by your strength . . . ,"[436] and

---

432. "Ποτήριον σωτηρίου λήψομαι . . ."
433. "Εἰρήνη πᾶσι. Τὰς κεφαλὰς ἡμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ κλίνωμεν."
434. "Πρόσχωμεν· τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις."
435. "Εἷς ἅγιος."
436. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ πάντα ποιήσας τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου . . ."

came out and apparently communed the newlyweds with a labis or kochliarion.[437] Eventually, the common cup alone prevailed, together with the prayer of its blessing, that also pre-existed before the separation of marriage and Liturgy.

It should not surprise us that in some places the sharing of bread has still been preserved. These places proved to be more conservative of liturgical practice. It would be desirable that we return to the ancient practice, in the connection of marriage and Liturgy, and the substitutes to be replaced by holy communion, which constitutes, according to Symeōn of Thessaloniki, the "end of every rite and [the seal] of every divine mystery," "and the Church rightly acting prepares the divine gifts, for atonement and blessing of those being joined, since He [the Lord] was at the marriage,[438] coming, and giving and being the gifts for their peaceful union and concord" (*Dialogue*, chapter 282).[439] Nevertheless, until this takes place, let the offering of bread remain, wherever it continues to still be preserved, in order to remind together with the common cup, the newlyweds and the Church, regarding the need for their participation in the Heavenly Bread and in the true cup of life, the Body and Blood of the Lord.[440]

## 66

**In some regions the priests offer loukoumi after the common cup to the newlyweds, the best man, and their parents. Is this canonical?**

This practice, or something similar to it, is also attested to by certain manuscripts of the fifteenth–sixteenth centuries, such as *Megistēs Lavras 21, 105* and *National Library of Athens 64*. The first notes that after the common cup, "often some give [to the newlyweds] pieces of bread with honey." The second notes after the last troparion of the

437. "κοχλιάριο." This is an ancient word for a type of spoon.

438. A reference to the marriage at Cana (John 2:1–11).

439. PG 155:512d.

440. This answer reflects the environment of Greece, where almost the entire populace is technically Orthodox and can share holy communion during a marriage ceremony celebrated in the context of a Liturgy.

sacred dance, "Glory to you, O Christ God . . . ,"[441] that "if there is honey and nuts prepared [the priest] gives them a small taste three times," while the troparion was chanted, "All creation rejoices in you, O full of grace . . . ."[442] Finally, in the third, the offering appears more developed. Before the common cup, a cup of honey and almonds is presented "and [the priest] takes one almond with honey and first gives to the man three times, then to the woman also to her three times and uses one almond for both, namely, for the man and for the woman; and while they partake the priest says, 'In the name of the Father' and gives to him one. 'And the Son," and gives to him a second. 'And the Holy Spirit,' and gives to him a third; similarly, also for the woman."

According to the witness of ancient authors, such as Tertullian and the author of the *Canons of Hippolytus*, in the ancient church a similar custom became prevalent after baptism and the first communion of the newly illumined. At that time, a cup with milk and honey was offered to them in order that their rebirth and the sweetness of eternal good things might be signified. And the origin and the symbolism of the respective practice in marriages must be analogous. With the honey and the almonds, the sweetness and happiness of life is signified, which the newlyweds will taste jointly in marriage. The offering of loukoumi is certainly the same practice, which continues in certain places under a more contemporary form, such as likewise also the placing of Jordan almonds[443] on the tray with the crowns and their distribution to the attendees, which are also made with similar ingredients.

You see how a custom, simple at first glance, against which one would perhaps be ready to hurl the stone of anathema, has a history and significance, and its survival in certain areas, despite the passage of so many centuries, could be welcomed with joy, thanks to the conservatism of our priests.

441. "Δόξα σοι Χριστὲ ὁ Θεός . . ."
442. "Ἐπὶ σοὶ χαίρει, κεχαριτωμένη . . ."
443. "κουφέτα."

## 67

### When is Small Vespers chanted? Why is it called Small? Great Vespers is always chanted and the Typikon refers nowhere concerning the use of the Small.

First, we must be reminded that the daily services as they are celebrated nowadays in the temples of the Orthodox Church are purely monastic services and the liturgical books that contain them (Hōrologion, Paraklētikē, Mēnaia, Triōdion, and Pentēkostarion) are purely monastic liturgical books. In parishes, different services of Vespers, the Pannychis, Matins, and the Trithektē Hour were celebrated, which except only in manuscripts did not survive.[444] These

444. In question 282, Phountoulēs provides the following discussion of the Pannychis:

This is about the "asmatic" service of the Pannychis (*παννυχίς*), which was celebrated in parish temples of the Byzantine empire before the prevalence of the monastic Jerusalemite service of Compline. It was originally celebrated on the evening of all days of the year. Its celebration was later limited only to great feasts, Great Lent, and Great Week. Finally, it was preserved in its penitential form for the first five days of the first week of the Fast. A remnant of this practice is the series of gospel pericopes that were preserved in our liturgical books in use, in the gospel readings, where also their reading was preserved in the monastic service of Compline in parallel to the Pannychis. The "asmatic" Pannychis is not an all-night service, as its name might mislead us to assume [Note: In Greek, the term, "*παννυχίς*," is composed from the words, *πᾶσα* (all) and *νύξ* (night)], but a relatively short service, the celebration of which does not last more than one hour. In other words, the Pannychis was an evening service, which was celebrated after supper, as a kind of small vigil, a parish Compline, which also had quite a few things in common with the monastic Great Compline, such as Psalm 90 ("He who lives by the help of the Most High . . .), the hymn, "As a bodiless nature, the Cherubim . . . ," (*Ἡ ἀσώματος φύσις . . .*) and so forth. Therefore, it was natural for the service that replaced the "asmatic" Pannychis in the parishes to also preserve certain of its elements just as happened in this case with the gospel readings.

See also, Miguel Arranz, "Les prières presbytérales de la 'Pannychis' de l'ancien Euchologe byzantine et la 'Panikhida' des défunts," *OCP* 40 (1974): 314–343 and *OCP* 41 (1975): 119–139; and Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ Νυχθημέρου*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 1' (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 45–82. Also known as the "τριτοέκτη," for studies of the Trithektē (Τριθέκτη), see: M. Arranz, "Les prières presbytérales de la Tritoekti de l'ancien Euchologe byzantin," *OCP* 43 (1977): 70–93, 335–354; Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ Νυχθημέρου*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 1' (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 11–44.

are the services of the "secular"[445] or, as it was called, "asmatic"[446] Typikon. In parallel, in the monasteries, another Typikon was in force that had different services of Vespers, Compline, Midnight Office, Matins, and the four Hours (First, Third, Sixth, and Ninth), and in addition included intermediate services, the Mesōria and typika. These services had as their birthplace in Palestine and, particularly, the monastery of Saint Sabas, and for this reason the monastic Typikon is called "Jerusalemite" or the "Typikon of Saint Sabas."[447] The others, the "asmatic," developed in Antioch and, particularly, in Constantinople, and for this reason the secular Typikon is called Constantinopolitan. Up until the Iconoclastic period, both Typika were in force at the same time, the "asmatic" for parish temples and the monastic[448] for monasteries. From iconoclasm onwards, and here for different reasons, the secular Typikon slowly was discarded, and the monastic was also prevalent in the parish temples. To this day, this Typikon is in force throughout the entire Orthodox Church.

Now, the Small Vespers is a non-festive Vespers that is chanted in the monasteries at the regular time for Vespers connected with the Ninth Hour, which is provided for by the Typikon on those feast days that an all-night vigil will be celebrated. After the service of Compline during this vigil, Great Vespers, namely, the festive Vespers of the feast, is celebrated, after which the service of Matins is chanted. Thus, these days have two Vespers, the Small and the Great. Such days are the Sundays of the year, the feasts of the Lord and Mother of God, and the feasts of great saints, namely in those cases where the monastic typika provided in theory for the celebration of a vigil.

Thus, this Vespers, the Small one, has no relationship to the practice of the parishes and this service does not ever appear to have been celebrated in parish temples. Nevertheless, it is found in our liturgical books, because, as I mentioned at the beginning, these are

445. "κοσμικοῦ."
446. "ἀσματικοῦ."
447. See the discussion of the Typikon of Saint Sabas in the notes to question 56.
448. "μοναχικὸ ἢ μοναστικό." This is translated by the term, "monastic."

the liturgical books of the monasteries and, there alone, do they have their complete application. For this reason, also, the Typikon of the Great Church in force nowadays in parishes never makes any mention concerning a Small Vespers, but only regarding a Vespers that is no longer properly called "Great," since there does not exist nor existed in parish practice also a "Small one" in order that we might make this distinction between the two.

## 68

**During the reading of the eōthinon gospel, why do we turn to the north? Where is such a thing based?**

The "taxis" of the eōthinon gospel has developed in imitation of the events that are connected to the Resurrection of the Lord. The eōthinon gospel is read on Sunday, the day of the Resurrection, and around the hour, namely, "very early" (Luke 24:1), that the announcement of the Resurrection was heard. The pericopes refer to the occurrence of the Resurrection and the priest that reads them plays the role of the angel, who from the tomb of the Lord that is represented by the holy table, announced the Resurrection to the myrrhbearing women (Matt 28:5–7; Mark 16:6–7; Luke 24:5–6). Indeed, for this reason, according to Symeōn of Thessaloniki, it is read by a presbyter, "showing forth the perfect order of the angels" *(Dialogue*, chapter 351).[449] Certainly, consistent with the rubrics of the codices, the priest wears a white epitrachēlion and phelonion during its reading in order also in this way to represent the angel, who wore white raiment flashing like lightning (Matt 28:3, Mark 16:5). Afterwards, during the chanting of the Fiftieth Psalm, the Gospel book comes out—the risen Lord—into the midst of the temple and the faithful, and is venerated by them, like the Lord after the Resurrection stood "in the midst" of the disciples in the upper room of Holy Sion and received their veneration (Luke 24:36ff.; John 20:19ff.), as immediately after the Resurrection He received the veneration of the myrrhbearers (Matt 28:9). The transference of the "taxis of the eōthinon gospel" from its ancient place,

449. PG 155:649c.

namely, before the canons, to after them, which occurs nowadays in parish temples in order that more faithful are present, and the connection of the service of Matins with the Divine Liturgy, brought about a certain disruption and obscurity to the symbolism of the service. Thus, it no longer takes place a little after midnight, since Matins is celebrated during the early morning hours, neither can the priest change into white vestments, since he is already dressed in the vestments of the Divine Liturgy.

Therefore, within the whole resurrectional context of the "taxis of the eōthinon gospel," the reason for the priest's position during its reading must be sought. During the respective narrative of the evangelist Mark, when the women entered the tomb "they saw a young man sitting at the right" and heard from his mouth, "Do not be amazed; you seek Jesus of Nazareth who was crucified. He has risen, He is not here; see the place where they laid Him" (Mark 16:5–6). Precisely the position that the priest occupies to the side of the holy table—the tomb of the Lord—is that to the right of the altar.

For the same reason, during the ancient period, the eōthinon gospel was still read by the priest, but from the ambōn, which was found at that time in the middle of the temple before the central gate of the altar. The ambōn represented "the stone that had been rolled away" from the tomb (Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Explanation concerning the divine temple,* 23).[450] There, the angel with raiment "white as snow" was seated according to the parallel narrative of the evangelist Matthew, and from there he announced the Resurrection to the myrrhbearers (Matt 28:2ff.).

450. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika,* 95.

## 69

**During the reading of the gospel pericopes in Church, is the omission or replacement of certain sentences or words permitted or not, as in the pericope of Matthew 22:25–30?**[451]

It is true that during the reading of this pericope in the Matins of Great Tuesday, namely, the service of the Bridegroom of Great Monday, our priests face certain problems. Well known are the whispers and the sarcastic smiles of some younger members of the congregation, who follow the recitation of certain phrases from this pericope, as well as some unseemly jokes, which circulate among the population regarding these phrases. It is likewise well known that some of our priests for these reasons either omit or adapt the known words. During the period when the sacred texts were written, these words were not debased to their present meaning and the sacred authors would have written them differently if they wrote today.

The same question also presents itself in other pericopes, such as the gospel reading of the Circumcision of the Forerunner (August 29) because of the passage of Mark 6:17 and in quite a few daily gospels, such as the Thursday of the First Week of Matthew (Matt 5:22), Friday of the Ninth Week of Luke (Luke 16:18), Monday of the Twelfth Week of Luke (Luke 20:34–35), Tuesday of the Fourteenth Week of Luke (Mark 10:11–12), Tuesday of the Sixteenth Week of Luke (Mark 12:25), but to a lesser degree in the gospel of the Eleventh Sunday of Luke (Luke 14:20), the Seventh Sunday of Matthew (Matt 9:35), Tuesday of the First Week of Matthew (Matt 4:23), and elsewhere, not to mention also the epistle readings, such as the Wednesday of the first week (Rom 1:26–27), Tuesday, Thursday and Friday of the seventh week (1 Cor 7:9–10, 28, 33–34, 36–39), Tuesday of the twenty-seventh week (1 Tim 5:11–14), along with several troparia, such as the doxastikon in the fourth tone of the lauds of the Holy Unmercenaries (November 1 and July 1), "Having the source of healing, Holy Unmercenaries . . . ,"[452] which is also

451. Phountoulēs is referring to words that have acquired vulgar connotations in modern Greek speech ("false cognates").

452. "Πηγὴν ἰαμάτων ἔχοντες, ἅγιοι Ἀνάργυροι, . . ."

chanted at the end of the Hagiasmos and the service of unction, and the doxastikon in the plagal of the second tone of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross (September 14), "Today the Cross of the Lord goes forth . . . ,"[453] along with a number of theotokia. We could augment this list also with other examples of pericopes, troparia, and even prayers, such as many prayers of the service of unction and many prayers of absolution, but our purpose is not for us to collect the relevant texts, but for us to show where it is possible for this to lead and what dimensions an arbitrary correction of the phrases could take, which might possibly be misunderstood by the faithful.

For this reason, I think that the impious (I do not consider the characterization to be excessive) meddling in sacred texts, for reasons of ill-intended modesty or for avoidance of the possible whispers of the thoughtless youth, certainly must stop. The sober[454] priest is not in danger of losing anything from his sobriety when reciting the sacred text as it is, and the ears of pious Christians are not in danger of being disturbed by the archaic words of the sacred reading when both also well understand exactly what they mean. And regardless of the audacious and reprehensible alteration of the sacred text, the priest is in greater danger of becoming a target of the comments of those who request them, if it becomes noticed that he attempts to avoid these words or to replace them, most times unsuccessfully, while the congregation knows, because of the frequent repetition of the pericopes, how exactly the ancient text is, especially indeed the so well-known pericope of Great Tuesday.

453. "Σήμερον προέρχεται ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Κυρίου . . ."
454. "σοβαρός." Sober in the sense of grave demeanor.

## 70

**In private Liturgies[455] is it permitted and appropriate during its first litany of peace and during the great entrance for the priest to also commemorate, "For those who celebrate this Liturgy,"[456] or not?**

As we all know, in the litanies of various services and mysteries, such as holy baptism, marriage, ordination, unction, Hagiasmoi, the Kneeling of Pentecost, and so forth, special petitions are inserted for those celebrating them or for the special circumstances to which they are referring. Nevertheless, the litanies of Vespers, Matins, and the Divine Liturgy are invariable and always the same. The hierarch alone is commemorated by name, while others not commemorated by name include kings and the abbot of the monastery (if these services take place in a monastery) and generally the other categories of faithful present and absent, those entering the temple, the presbyterate, the deacons, the clergy and the people, the inhabitants of the monastery or city, where the service is celebrated, as well as Christians facing difficulties, namely, those who sail, who travel, who are sick, who are in distress, who are in captivity, and so forth. Nor does the manuscript tradition know the insertion of supplications for other persons, and especially by name for those celebrating the Divine Liturgy. Consequently, the insertion of such petitions is not permitted.

On the other hand, the great ektenēs after the gospel reading is the designated place where the petition for those celebrating the

455. "Εἰς ἰδιωτικὰς λειτουργίας." In the Church of Greece, so-called "private Liturgies" are celebrated in small chapels on private lands or those belonging to parishes and monasteries. These Liturgies are celebrated on the basis of ad hoc requests from the faithful, often out of affinity or spiritual obligation to the saint for whom the chapel is dedicated. Although these ad hoc Liturgies are technically open to others, they are not part of the official parish calendar nor even made known to other congregants. The phrase "we opened the church" (ἀνοίξαμε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν) is an expression often heard in villages after a family has arranged and provided for the celebration of such a Liturgy, especially in the case of chapels not normally used.

456. "ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπιτελούντων τὴν λειτουργίαν ταύτην . . ."

Divine Liturgy would be inserted.[457] Precisely the petition, "Again we pray for mercy, life, peace . . .,"[458] is the point at which the commemoration of their names is inserted. After this, the petition—"for blessed memory and eternal repose . . ."[459] of those who have "fallen asleep," of those for whom the Liturgy is offered, and a commemoration of their names—is inserted by tradition. This petition does not exist in today's printed Euchologia and liturgical books, but is found in manuscripts and in Slavonic liturgical books, where certainly in special Liturgies for repose of the souls of those who have "fallen asleep," it has the form of a petition that is said in memorial services ("Have mercy on us O God . . . Again we pray for repose of the souls...That the Lord our God . . .") and is accompanied by the prayer, "O God of spirits . . . ,"[460] and an offering of incense.

Let us note that the ektenēs is omitted, or rather is said nowadays "inaudibly" during the Liturgies of Sundays and feasts in our temples, so that the length of the service is somehow limited, but in private Liturgies, where a reason for brevity does not exist, it should be said, let alone that it also wrongly became prevalent to be left out in the other cases that we mentioned.

Now with regard to the commemoration during the great entrance of those names on behalf of whom the Liturgy is celebrated, living or who have "fallen asleep," what we wrote when responding to question eleven applies. Provided that it is a private Liturgy, it is

---

457. For scholarship dealing with the ektenēs, see Juan Mateos, *La Célébration de la Parole dans la Liturgie Byzantine: Étude historique*, OCA 191 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1971), 148–156; the recent translation and updating of the latter work, Juan Mateos and Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *A History of the Liturgy St. John Chrysostom: Volume I The Liturgy of the Word* (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 2016), 237–244; Stefano Parenti, "L'*Ektenê* della Liturgia di Crisostomo nell' Eucologio St. Petersburg gr. 226 (X Secolo)," in *ΕΥΛΟΓΗΜΑ: Studies in Honor of Robert Taft, S.J.*, ed. Ephrem Carr, Stefano Parenti, Abraham-Andreas Thiermeyer, Elena Velkovska, Studia Anselmaniana 110, Analecta Liturgica 17 (Rome: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 1993), 295–318; Stefanos Alexopoulos, *The Presanctified Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite: A Comparative Analysis of Its Origins, Evolution, and Structural Units*, Liturgia Condenda 21 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 197–202.

458. "Ἔτι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ ἐλέους, ζωῆς, εἰρήνης . . ."

459. "ὑπὲρ μακαρίας μνήμης καὶ αἰωνίου ἀναπαύσεως . . ."

460. "Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων . . ."

good for the names of those offering to be commemorated both in the ektenēs and at the great entrance, just as they are indispensably commemorated during the proskomidē and after the consecration of the precious gifts. However, in the Liturgies of Sundays and feasts, which are offered by the entire and for the entire Christian community, it should never be the case that with the public commemoration of names the offering of the Divine Liturgy is customized on behalf of certain privileged persons alone.

## 71

**Should the supplications and prayers for the catechumens be read (inaudibly) during the Divine Liturgy or only the prayers for the faithful?**

The petitions for the catechumens with the prayer of inclination that accompanies it ("O Lord our God, who dwells on high . . .")[461] constitute an integral part of the Divine Liturgy and indispensably are said during it. In our parishes, it is prevalent for reasons of economy of time that they be read "inaudibly," but during the Presanctified Liturgies of Great Lent— which preserve a more ancient form—the petitions are exclaimed and only the prayer inaudibly. To these are added in the same manner from Wednesday of the mid-Lent week (τῆς Μεσονηστίμου ἑβδομάδος), also the relevant prayer and petitions for "those being illumined" or "those preparing for holy illumination," namely, of the catechumens who were preparing to be baptized on Great Saturday during the all-night vigil of Pascha. In the monasteries and in the Slavic churches, which as we wrote repeatedly are distinguished for their conservative liturgical practice, the petitions for catechumens are indispensably said at every Liturgy.

It is true that the supplications for the catechumens appear nowadays anachronistic. The order of catechumens no longer exists, nor are catechumens present at the Divine Liturgy and, nevertheless, they are called upon by the deacon or the priest to pray, to bow their heads, and to depart. But this anachronism, which logically bothers us nowadays and which is not the only anachronism found in our

461. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν . . ."

divine worship, is only superficial, because it concerns only the form and the manner that these petitions are introduced. The Church always had and has catechumens. They are the unbaptized infants and all who at the ends of the earth hear the word of God and are preparing to become members of the Church. We pray for them that they may be found worthy "at the proper time of the baptism of rebirth, the remission of sins, and the garment of incorruption" to be united with the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church and to be numbered among the chosen flock of the Lord. In a different sense, could not also the children that are taught Christian catechism after baptism be called catechumens? And concerning "catechumens" of this kind, should not the entreaties mention, "That the Lord will have mercy on them, that He will teach them the word of truth, that He will reveal to them the gospel of righteousness"[462]?

The Divine Liturgy contains supplications for all existing and possible conditions of the faithful, present and absent. Our faithful, lest I say much more our priests, must learn to pray both for them and, indeed, for those who are preparing to become Christians. And such persons exist, and we must pray that many exist in order for the blood of the Church to be renewed and new peoples to enter her bosom. Let this petition be somewhat anachronistic in its form. In essence, even if it is done only by the priest (given that it became prevalent in our country[463] on Sundays that it be said at least "inaudibly"), it remains as a petition of the Church for her catechumens, which when said, on the one hand we remember the Church's sacred duty of spreading the faith to peoples outside of the Church, and, on the other hand we pray for new Christians who are being catechized and are preparing for baptism in the depths of Africa or, also, in any other place of the world it pleases God that the gospel of His truth is preached.

---

462. "Ἵνα ὁ Κύριος αὐτοὺς ἐλεήσῃ, κατηχήσῃ αὐτοὺς τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀποκαλύψῃ αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης." Translation taken from Greek Orthodox Archdiocese, *The Divine Liturgy of our Father among the saints John Chrysostom, Large Clergy Edition* (New York: Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, 2018), 16.

463. Greece.

## 72

**Where can the tablecloths that have already been used as the holy table's coverings be used?**

In principle, the placement of many coverings—and not the assigned ones—on the holy table must be avoided. Thus, both its appearance will be aesthetically beautiful and we will be faced fewer times with the problem that the question poses. As is well known, the vesture of the holy table is formed from only three coverings: the "katasarkion" (κατασάρκιον), namely the white linen that is placed by the hierarch during the consecration directly on the marble of the holy altar and tied to the legs that support it, the "endytē" (ἐνδυτή), namely the covering luxurious as possible that covers the entire altar and often drops from the four sides to the floor, and the "eilēton/antiminsion" (εἰλητόν/ἀντιμίνσιον), which is spread out only during the Divine Liturgy and remains folded under the Gospel book during the rest of the time. If we so arrange the vesture of the altar table, it remains for us to consider only the endytē, because the katasarkion is never changed and when the eilēton wears out we can put it aside in a cabinet of the skeuophylakion. On the other hand, the endytē rarely can wear out both because great use of it does not occur and because it is made of relatively good fabric. When new donors come forward, it is good for the priest to take the initiative and to guide them in the manner of design and in the choice of color for the endytē, so that it completely conforms to the dimensions of the altar and the temple has endytes of various colors so that they can be changed accordingly with the periods of the year and move to black or purple during Lent; white during the period of Pascha; and other colors during the rest of the feasts, as well as during the non-festal periods of the liturgical year. If this changing takes place and these vestments are maintained clean, pressed, and carefully folded during the rest of the year, it is questionable whether there would ever be a need for us to think about what we should do with them.

However, if this happens to us contrary to expectations, we must be aware that their use outside of the temple, their conversion into secular garments, and their employment in a common use is not

permitted for any reason. The canons strictly forbid this, such as canon seventy-three of the Holy Apostles and canon ten of the First-Second Council.[464] The pertinent provision of the Euchologion "concerning the holy table, whose vestments were worn out" directs that they be put "in new vessels," but does not say what exactly takes place afterwards. In any case, there existed a custom to burn or bury as many of them as are unsuitable for future use. Still if they are not completely damaged, they can be altered and used either as coverings for the sacred prothesis, whose sacredness is analogous to the sacredness of the altar, or as coverings of the holy tables of chapels[465] or countryside churches.[466] In this manner, these things will also be acceptable, and the coverings of the holy table will not be profaned.

## 73

**Is it permitted for the attendees to shower Jordan almonds[467] on the newlyweds during "Isaiah dance . . . ,"[468] a thing that causes disorder and sometimes inappropriate incidents?**

The attendees showering blossoms, rice, Jordan almonds, and coins on the newlyweds during the service of marriage is a fairly ancient custom and perhaps even pre-Christian. There exist witnesses that even during the Byzantine period they showered on the pair during the sacred dance of the service of marriage, "sesame seeds and barley, regarding them as omens since they are fruitful."[469] The meaning of

464. See question 61.

465. "τὰ παρεκκλήσια." Chapels can be located on the aisles, in separate sections of larger temples, or even within the boundaries of a parish. Small chapels can also be embedded in monastery buildings, such as a tower. This word can be understood as being in distinction from the central temple or altar. See also question 80 for a discussion of chapels versus the central temple.

466. "τὰ ἐξωκκλήσια," country-side churches, are chapels or small temples located often "outside" (ἔξω) villages and towns, and frequently placed on property donated by farmers and other landholders.

467. "κουφέτα."

468. "Ἡσαΐα χόρευε . . ."

469. Tryphōn, "Περὶ αἰνίγματος", in *Περὶ τρόπων*, ed. Leonhard von Spengel, Rhetores Graeci (Leipzig: Teubner, 1856), 3:194. The author was a grammarian from Alexandria, generally dated in the first century B.C. The work concerned rhetorical figures used in poetry and was reworked during the Byzantine period. A redaction of the work was wrongly attributed to the

this custom is revealed precisely in the phrase above. Namely, it a type of wish for the "taking root"[470] of the newlyweds, for fertility and fruitfulness and increase of material goods, as well as a manifestation of joy.

I do not think it is possible for anyone to succeed in the eradication of this custom by prohibiting it. Nevertheless, it is possible for it to take place with more respectability, without Jordan almonds and coins also being thrown in an unfitting manner. And this already takes place when those attending the marriage have an awareness of the sacredness of the mystery and of the temple's space in which it is celebrated. The efforts of our priests must turn towards this direction.[471]

For the history of the matter, I note that His Eminence Metropolitan Ambrosios (Stavrinos) of Caesarea in his relevant study (*The Benediction of Marriage*, Constantinople 1923, p. 159)[472] proposes the eradication of the sacred dance, precisely because "the customary showering in this way of blossoms and so forth, but especially of coins, upon newlyweds when dancing or entering, is a source of disorder that many times gives rise to an abomination."[473] I cite this in order to show to what extremes an exaggerated zeal for an ideal taxis in our services can lead and how, along with certain excesses and faults, good things can be swept way as well, and irreparable damage can occur to our sacred services, as would happen if the audacious proposal of His Eminence of Caesarea became accepted.

---

twelfth century Byzantine, Grēgorios of Corinth. This discussion is based on Fausto Montana, "Hellenistic Scholarship," in *History of Ancient Greek Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Byzantine Age*, ed. Franco Montanari (Boston, MA: Brill, 2020), 256.

470. "ρίζωμα." The term bears a resemblance to the Greek word, "ρύζι," for rice.

471. To accommodate the custom, some priests attempted to have such expressions of joy take place outside of the temple as the couple was exiting and not during "Isaiah dance . . . ."

472. Ἀμβρόσιος Σταυρινός, *Ἡ Ἱερολογία τοῦ γάμου ἀπὸ τὰ τέλη τοῦ Θ΄ μέχρι τοῦ τέλους τοῦ ΙΣΤ΄ αἰώνος* (Κωνσταντινούπολη: Ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1923). Ambrosios Stavrinos (1854–1931) after serving in several sees as a hierarch, including Neocaesarea, ended his career as Metropolitan of Derkoi (r. 1929–1931).

473. Σταυρινός, *Ἡ Ἱερολογία*, 159.

## 74

**In order for us to make a German Protestant an Orthodox, how must we proceed?**

The question must be submitted to the hierarch of your eparchy, who, as the one responsible and qualified, will determine whether your catechumen shall be accepted into the Orthodox Church through holy baptism or only myron. He will examine whether his/her baptism took place in the name of the Holy Trinity, so he/she can by oikonomia not be baptized, or if the denomination to which he/she belonged did not believe in the Holy Trinity—because there are also such types of Protestants—then to be sure he/she must be baptized. This is the principle that generally applies, although an official and unanimous decision of the Orthodox churches does not exist on this point. Nevertheless, a necessary presupposition for entrance to take place into the Orthodox Church is for his/her systematic catechesis before baptism to be done by you and by a clerical theologian, either in his/her language or in Greek, after he/she first learns our language sufficiently well, at least as much as he/she needs to understand the things that you are teaching him/her. Examine first of all also whether his/her intentions and decision to become Orthodox are sincere, firm, and final. In cases like the one you face, our main concern must be to produce faithful, who are good and devoted to the Church, who will worthily bear the name of Orthodox Christian within the heterodox environment where they will live, and not many, but lukewarm in the confession of the Orthodox faith.

## 75

**When a woman is on her period, can she come to church, receive antidōron, and kiss icons?**

This is forbidden by canon two of Saint Dionysios of Alexandria, which states as follows: "Concerning women in menstruation, whether they ought to enter the house of God in such a state, I think it superfluous even to put the question. For, I think, not even they themselves, being faithful and pious, would dare when in this state

either to approach the holy table or to touch the Body and Blood of Christ. For not even the woman with twelve years' issue would come into actual contact with Him, but only with the edge of His garment, to be cured.[474] There is no objection to one's praying no matter how one may be or to one's remembering the Lord at any time and in any state whatever, and petitioning to receive help; but if anyone is not wholly pure both in soul and in body, they shall be prevented from coming up to the Holy of Holies."[475] The canon mainly prohibits going to communion, however not only this, but also entrance into the temple and participation in any other means of sanctification. Related are also canons six and seven of Saint Timotheos of Alexandria, the first of which orders the deferment of baptism for a female catechumen "in menstruation" "until she might be purified," and the second orders not going to holy communion during these days.[476]

One can find more on this subject in the commentaries of Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain on canon two of Saint Dionysios in

474. Luke 8:43–48, Mark 5:24–34.

475. Saint Dionysios of Alexandria (d. 264–265) is attributed four canons that are derived from his letter to Basileidēs of Pentapolis. For the text, see Ἀγάπιος ἱερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 547, and Rhallēs and Potlēs, 4:7. Translation adapted from D. Cummings, trans., *The Rudder (Pedalion) of the Metaphorical Ship of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Orthodox Christians, or all the sacred and divine canons of the holy and renowned apostles, of the holy councils, ecumenical as well as regional, and of the individual divine Fathers, as embodied in the original Greek text, for the sake of authenticity, and explained in the vernacular by way of rendering them more intelligible to the less educated by Agapius, A Hieromonach and Nicodemus, A Monk and diligently redacted at the instance of His Superlative All-Holiness and of the Sacred and Holy Synod by Seignior Dorotheus, and Erudite Teacher and Preacher, first printed and published (AD 1800) by permission and exhortation and order of the Superlatively All-Holy and Ecumenical Patriarch and of the Holy Synod, under the supervision of Theodoret (Ath.) of Ioannina, one among the Hieromonachs. The whole now faithfully translated into English from the fifth edition published by John Nicolaides (Kesioglou the Caesarean) in Athens, Greece 1908* (Chicago: The Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1983), 718.

476. Saint of Timotheos of Alexandria (d. 385). For the text, see Rhallēs and Potlēs, 4:334–335.

the *Rudder* and in the book of Father Gervasios Paraskevopoulos, *Topical Problems*, Athens, 1954, pp. 44–46.[477]

## 76

**When must the naming of the babies take place, during the prayer of the eighth day that is read before the baptism, or is the name given during the first or the last prayer of the catechumens?**

According to the very widespread popular view, naming and baptism are two nearly synonymous things, and for this reason "I baptize" has generally come to mean "I give a name" (see also "baptismal name"). As a result of this perception, there were family feuds and attempted rebaptisms that occurred in our land[478] during recent times, even written about in the press, because the parents did not agree on the name that they would give to their children. But perhaps we all have also encountered such cases, where as a result there is frequently the postponement of holy baptism, until an acceptable solution might be found by all interested members of the family. It is scarcely necessary for us to write that the association of naming with baptism is wrong. In whatever prayers of the service of baptism, the name of the one being baptized is inserted, even in the phrase, "The servant of God . . . is baptized in the name of the Father..." and so forth, the insertion is done not in order for the name to be given, but in order that the reason in baptizing a person is specified, who is already known with his/her name to the Church. Namely, here also takes place precisely what occurs in "The servant of God is

477. Author's footnote: The Very Reverend Archimandrite E. Stylios published a different opinion, *Ὁ Ἐφημέριος* 6 (1967): 234–235, as well as the Reverend Oikonomos K. Papagiannēs, *op. cit., p.* 357. Translator's addition: Kōnstantinos Papagiannēs (1929–2014). For the commentaries of Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain on canon two of Saint Dionysios, see Ἀγάπιος ἱερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 547–549. The full citation for Paraskevopoulos is Γερβάσιος Χαρ. Παρασκευόπουλος, *Ἐπίκαιρα Προβλήματα* (Ἀθήνα: n.p., 1954). An additional viewpoint on the subject can be found in Patrick Viscuso, "Menstruation: A Problem in Late Byzantine Canon Law," *Byzantine Studies/Études Byzantines New Series* 4 (1999): 116–125.

478. Greece.

betrothed" or "is crowned . . ." or "The servant of God partakes..." or "Give rest to the soul of your servant . . ." or in other prayers and services of our Church.

For the same reason, the name of the catechumen is inserted also in the prayer, "for the making of a catechumen,"[479] which preceded the exorcisms ("In your name, O Lord of Truth . . . I lay my hand on your servant . . ."[480]), as also in the prayer, "O Master, Lord our God, call this your servant . . .to holy illumination . . . ,"[481] which is read after the end of the renunciation and joining, and the confession of faith. Thus, naming is also wrongly associated with these prayers.

But let us take note of the service of the churching of the baby on the fortieth day from its birth, and again here it is presupposed that the baby bears a name ("The servant of God . . . is churched"). Consistent with ecclesiastical tradition, the name is given to the child on the eighth day from its birth. As we know, there is a special prayer in our Euchologia "for the sealing of the child when it receives a name on the eighth day from its birth,"[482] which begins with the phrase, "O Lord our God, to you we pray, and on you do we call. Let the light of your countenance be signed upon your servant . . . ."[483] According to the relevant standard rubrics, the baby is brought to the temple by the midwife "in order to receive a name," and before the gates of the temple the small service is celebrated, which includes a trisagion, troparia, a prayer, "a sealing" of the baby, and, in some manuscripts, Psalm 5, "Hearken to my words, O Lord . . . ,"[484] and a dismissal. The main component of the service is the "blowing" and the "sealing" by the hand of the priest in the shape of a cross on the forehead, the mouth, and the chest of the baby, along with the prayer, which is very old and is also found even in the most ancient

479. "εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι κατηχούμενον."

480. "Ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου, Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς τῆς ἀληθείας . . ."

481. "Δέσποτα Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, προσκάλεσαι τὸν δοῦλόν σου . . . πρὸς τὸ ἅγιον φώτισμα."

482. "εἰς τὸ κατασφραγίσαι παιδίον λαμβάνον ὄνομα τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς γεννήσεως αὐτοῦ."

483. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, σοῦ δεόμεθα καί σε παρακαλοῦμεν· Σημειωθήτω τὸ φῶς τοῦ προσώπου σου ἐπὶ τὸν δοῦλον σου . . ."

484. "Τὰ ῥήματά μου ἐνώτισαι Κύριε . . ."

manuscripts. The "sealing" took place, and this prayer was read when a non-Christian came forward and declared his/her final decision to become a member of the Church. His/Her name was then recorded, and he/she now belonged to the order of Christian catechumens. For this reason, the prayer makes special mention of the holy name of Christ, which from now on he/she will bear, and he/she will be called a Christian. After the prevalence of infant baptism, the presentation of the baby at the temple took place on the eighth day and at that time he/she was named, just as exactly this took place in the case of the Lord (Luke 2:21) and Saint John the Forerunner (Luke 1:59–63) and as the Jews generally did during the period of Christ.

This practice was maintained throughout the Byzantine period. Symeōn of Thessaloniki, who writes a little before the Fall[485] (d. 1429), refers to the naming on the eighth day as something that was commonly practiced at that time: "On the eighth day, the baby is brought by them before God and before the gates [of the temple], since it is not yet sanctified by baptism, the priest again seals it [the first seal took place on the day of birth] on the forehead, the mouth, and the chest and gives a name to it by a sacred prayer, whichever the parents might want, with which it is also baptized, just as this also took place in the case of the Lord, since on the eighth day when circumcised He was named Jesus[486]. . . for which reason also on the eighth day the baby receives the name, just as the Savior, who was called the saving name Jesus, after being sealed and receiving a sacred prayer, as one who is presented to the Lord and who is sealed with the cross on the forehead, as I said, on account of the intellect, the mouth on account of speech, and the heart on account of the vital principle; and inscribed in the eternal book by the name given it, it is returned to its mother"[487] (*Dialogue*, chapters 59–60). Theoretically, this is in force and should also be done nowadays. Namely, on the eighth day, the baby ought to be brought to the temple and, just as the Lord on the eighth day, he/she also ought to receive his/

485. The fall of Thessaloniki to the Ottomans in 1430.
486. PG 155:209a.
487. PG 155:209d.

her name and the appropriate prayer ought to be read for him/her by the priest.

Nevertheless, it is an open secret that this service has fallen into disuse. No one any longer presents the baby on the eighth day at the temple, or names him/her on it. Certainly, it would be desirable that an effort for the revival of this beautiful and most ancient practice take place. If somewhere by chance it is preserved, it must be strengthened, and its ancient and biblical content be given it. Any other solution constitutes an improper act, which is neither consistent with the letter or even with the spirit of the naming. However, in order for us to be pragmatic and objective, we must admit that the return to the correct practice is not about to take place in the near future. On the contrary, new conditions of life drive matters in the opposite direction. The return to the correct practice requires labor, systematic work, coordination of efforts, special preparation of the clergy, and special catechism of the laity, things which cannot take place today or tomorrow and the naming will not be the first thing that will occupy the Church if she wishes to undertake such an effort. For now, the least improper solution must be sought which our priests would be able to apply to the current circumstances. Let us seek it by applying a process of elimination.

The service of naming cannot be appended to the prayer "for a woman in childbed,"[488] which is read on the day of birth because the service presupposes the presence of the baby at the temple, while the prayer is read in the home. But neither can it be seen as taking place during the first and the last prayers for catechumens, nor also at the baptism for the reasons that we mentioned. The least improper thing would be that it precedes the service of the fortieth day, if the baby has not been baptized before then, when first the presupposition of bringing the baby to the temple is fulfilled and second, we find ourselves closer to the eighth day from birth. Indeed, in some later manuscripts (*Megistēs Lavras 189, Metochiou Pan. Taphou Kōnstantinoupoleōs 8, National Library of Athens 781* and *851*) both these services are shown combined. Thus, also during, "The servant of

488. "εἰς γυναῖκα λεχώ."

God is churched . . ." the priest could insert the name of the child and not merely avoid it, as often takes place nowadays. However, we fear that this solution, which is the least incorrect, as we wrote, will be inapplicable for the reason that, upon the priest's inquiry concerning with what name the child will be called, in most circumstances he will receive the response that it has not yet been decided what name will be given him/her. Thus, at the present time, the only solution remains that the prayer of naming precedes the service of holy baptism, namely, to be read before the prayer "for making a catechumen." Thus, if not the spirit, at least partially the letter of the service of naming will be fulfilled.[489]

## 77

**Is it permitted for lay sacred preachers to put on the exōrason when they speak in the temple and afterwards take it off?**

I think that not only is the lay sacred preacher who preaches the word of God permitted, but it is also essential that he wear the rason at the time of the holy sermon. If sacred chanters and sextons, who perform relatively lesser services within the temple, put on this vesture during the exercise of their duties, then much more does this apply for that one who at that time exercises, after the office of priest, the most sacred service within the Christian synaxis, namely, the announcement of God's will, the prophetic office itself of the Lord. Thus, his appearance, both serious and solemn, becomes also proportional to the lofty work that he performs. The attire of the one preaching with sacred vesture further indicates vividly, that the sacred preacher speaks not himself, but that he is an instrument of the Church, who by order and with permission of the bishop teaches the people and interprets the word of God, thus ministering, according to the Apostle Paul, the gospel of God (Rom 15:16).

489. The reason for reluctance on the part of the priest could be due to the prevalence of feuds that take place over naming children. In modern Greece, there is a tradition of naming children after grandparents, who sometimes feud over the naming. This cultural problem is manifested in Greek civil law where a provision exists to allow a deferment for naming a newborn child until a later time (and not at the time of birth as is customary in other countries).

## 78

**Is it permitted for a lay sacred preacher[490] to ascend and preach from the despotikon throne or to stand only on its first step, and this only by oikonomia?[491]**

Before we respond to this question of the reverend presbyter, it is necessary that certain things be clarified. The canonical throne of the bishop is not that which is found at the right side of the nave, but that which stands in back of the apse of the sacred altar right behind the holy table. Namely, it is the "upper throne" (ἄνω καθέδρα), the central throne of the sacred synthronon, which, according to the Byzantine commentators of the Divine Liturgy represents the throne of the glory of the Lord or even the most holy Theotokos herself, who through her birth-giving that transcends nature became the throne of the King of Glory. In old temples, and especially in cathedrals, this throne existed and still exists; and the hierarch ascended it after the small entrance of the Divine Liturgy and occupies it even nowadays during the chanting of the trisagion. It is forbidden not only for celebrating priests to ascend it, but even a hierarch of another eparchy when he performs priestly functions by permission of the local bishop in a temple of his eparchy. Mention is made especially regarding this enthronement in the traditional enthronement letter of new bishops, who together with the other privileges that they have in their eparchy also possess "installation on the sacred synthronon" (τῆς τοῦ ἱεροῦ συνθρόνου ἐγκαθιδρύσεως). Much more is forbidden the mounting of any layperson on this throne.

---

490. "ἱεροκήρυξ."

491. In Greece, there are four grades of priests based on education. In general, only those priests with a theological degree are automatically granted permission to preach. Otherwise, priests without the requisite education generally read encyclicals in place of sermons on the Scriptural readings in temples. In addition, there are lay persons with Orthodox theological degrees that are authorized and appointed by the Synod of Greece as "sacred preachers" who have also been granted approval to give sermons, often travelling to various communities. In the twentieth century, one of the most well-known lay sacred preachers in the Church of Greece was Dēmētrios Panagopoulos (Δημήτριος Παναγόπουλος) (1916–1982). Such "sacred preachers" can also include clergy. The question only concerns lay sacred preachers.

The other throne, which is found in the central nave of the temple, is much more recent and was erected there after the elevation of the templon so that the hierarch is presiding in liturgical synaxes in a manner that is visible by the people.[492] In sources, it is named "seat of the hierarch" (στασίδιον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως) or "despotikon [seat]" (δεσποτικόν [στασίδιον]). According to one account, it was the throne of the Byzantine emperor, which in a sense the ethnarch-hierarch inherited after the fall of the empire; although it is known that even before the conquest, hierarchs also had such a throne in the nave of the temple. In monasteries, the abbot uses it on great feasts and when the king is present, they grant it to him as a token of honor.[493] In the Slavic churches, a despotikon throne of such a type does not exist. We do not wish to demean its sacredness with the things that we write. It is also a throne of the bishop and, even when the bishop is absent, it is censed by the priest or the deacon, and the celebrants bow to it when they "take kairos."

Insofar as now the sacred preacher, whether he is a clergyman or a layperson, teaches the people during the Divine Liturgy or during other sacred services with the permission and by order of the bishop, it is not blameworthy if he also uses the hierarchical seat for the delivery of sacred preaching. Moreover, in many temples the despotikon is the only place in the sacred temple that can be used as a platform due to its position and height. It is self-evident that the sacred preacher will ascend and stand on it with the due compunction and piety. Now whether he will stand on the steps or step on the base of the throne, this depends on the height of the despotikon and on the width of the steps, which oftentimes are minimally practical so that the speaker might feel a basic, but necessary comfort in his posture and movement. However, this

492. Regarding the presiding of the hierarch on the despotikon, see questions 243–248, where a distinction is made between the bishop presiding on his throne next to the choir as opposed to actually officiating or serving the Divine Liturgy from the holy sanctuary.

493. Greece was a kingdom at the time of this writing. However, even nowadays, civil authorities such as prime ministers and visiting presidents from Orthodox countries are accorded this privilege, for example, in the monasteries of Mount Athos.

question is very secondary. The essential point is that the word of God is heard as often as possible and let the seat of the hierarch also be used as a platform, a thing moreover that has become established almost everywhere.

## 79

**Is it permitted to use the reserved Great Hagiasmos for any illness of Christians?**

It appears that the custom is quite ancient for the Great Hagiasmos of Theophany to be kept in the homes of the faithful or in temples, and to be given instead of holy communion to persons who fall into certain grave sins and are prohibited by the spiritual father to commune. Thus, the sacred Chrysostomos in his oration on the Holy Baptism of the Lord speaks concerning Christians of his period, who had the custom of drawing sanctified water during this feast and keeping it in their homes throughout the course of the year and even up to two or three additional years.[494] Certainly, their intent was to drink from it or to anoint themselves and to be sanctified, if during the course of the year they found themselves in spiritual or in physical need. Again, the Euchologion in *Monastery of Sinai 978* from the sixteenth century contains the following characteristic counsel to the priest, after the service of Great Hagiasmos: "Be mindful of yourself, O Priest, that you shall not give Hagiasmos to anyone who has not fasted, just as some ignorant ones do . . . God forbid! . . . . After the morning Liturgy [of holy Theophany], Hagiasma is not at all thrown away, but is honored and held in esteem and it is considered even second to holy communion."

However, this partaking of Great Hagiasmos in lieu of holy communion, which the above manuscript suggests, does not preclude its

494. Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos, *De baptismo Christi et Epiphania* 2 (PG 49:366). The title of the homily is "Πρὸς τοὺς ἀπολιμπανομένους τῶν θείων συνάξεων, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον καὶ σωτήριον βάπτισμα τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀναξίως κοινωνούντων, καὶ ὅτι οἱ ἀτέλεστον καταλιμπάνοντες τὴν θείαν λειτουργίαν, καὶ πρὸ τελευταίας εὐχῆς ἐξερχόμενοι, τὸν Ἰούδαν μιμοῦνται, λόγος."

partaking also by the sick "for healing" of their physical illnesses. On the contrary, not only the witness of the sacred Chrysostomos that we cited, but even the service of the Great Hagiasmos itself, also suggest an analogous use. In its litany of peace, for example, there are two petitions associated with the healing of the spiritual and physical illnesses of the faithful: "That this water may become a gift of sanctification, a remedy of sins, for the healing of soul and body and every expedient purpose . . ."[495] and "That it may become a cleansing of souls and bodies for all who draw on it with faith and partake of it . . . ."[496] Again, towards the end of the great prayer for sanctification of the water, "Great are You, O Lord, and marvelous are your works . . . ,"[497] there is the entreaty, "Grant sanctification, blessing, cleansing, and health to all who touch, are anointed, and partake."[498] Finally, in the prayer of inclination, "Incline your ear, O Lord, and hearken to us . . . ,"[499] the priest prays in order that the partaking and sprinkling with the sanctified water might bring spiritual and physical health to Christians fallen ill.

The Church has a specific mystery, unction, and specific prayers and intercessory services for the healing of the physical and spiritual illnesses of persons. However, this does not prevent providing to them also the Great Hagiasmos, insofar as the same ones with faith request it and request by this from the "physician of our souls and bodies" the cure and healing of their souls and bodies, concerning which so many portions of the service of the Great Hagiasmos especially mention, which we gathered above.

---

495. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ γενέσθαι τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο ἁγιασμοῦ δῶρον, ἁμαρτημάτων λυτήριον, εἰς ἴασιν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, καὶ πᾶσαν ὠφέλειαν ἐπιτήδειον . . ."

496. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ γενέσθαι αὐτὸ πρὸς καθαρισμὸν ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων, πᾶσι τοῖς ἁρυομένοις πίστει, καὶ μεταλαμβάνουσιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ . . ."

497. "Μέγας εἶ, Κύριε, καὶ θαυμαστὰ τὰ ἔργα σου . . ."

498. "Δὸς πᾶσι τοῖς ἁπτομένοις, τοῖς τε χριομένοις, τοῖς τε μεταλαμβάνουσιν τὸν ἁγιασμόν, τὴν εὐλογίαν, τὴν κάθαρσιν, τὴν ὑγείαν."

499. "Κλῖνον, Κύριε, τὸ οὖς σου, καὶ ἐπάκουσον ἡμῶν . . ."

## 80

**Why is the transport of Presanctified Bread from one temple to another not permitted for celebration of the Liturgy of the Presanctified, while the transport of the Holy Bread of Great Thursday is permitted for communion of the sick?**

The transport of the Holy Bread from temple to temple for the celebration of the Presanctified Liturgy indeed is forbidden. When a Liturgy of the Presanctified is going to be celebrated in another temple (not the parish one) or in a chapel, a Liturgy is celebrated in it on Saturday or Sunday and the Presanctified Bread required for the celebration of the Liturgy of the Presanctified during the week is kept in the artophorion of this temple. However, in this case, the priest must ensure the conditions that are required for the security of the Presanctified Bread, which countryside churches or chapels do not always afford.[500] For this reason, also, generally, a celebration of the Presanctified must be avoided outside of parish temples, unless special reasons intervene, such as, for example, when the temple is dedicated in the memory of the Holy Forty Martyrs[501] or another saint whose commemoration falls during the weekdays of Great Lent.

It is not precisely known for what reason currently the transport of Presanctified Bread is forbidden. The example of taking the Holy Eucharist to the sick cannot have a complete application to the case of the Presanctified, because it occurs for reasons of special and serious need. However, it shows that our Church did not ever consider their transport outside of the temple as a desecration of the Holy Elements. We have very ancient witnesses that the Precious Gifts were taken by the deacons to absent Christians for communion, as

500. The word, "τὰ ἐξωκκλήσια," refers to country-side churches that are chapels or small temples located often "outside" (ἔξω) villages and towns, and frequently placed on property donated by farmers and other landholders. The word, "τὰ παρεκκλήσια," refers to chapels that can be located as altars on the aisles and in separate sections of larger temples, or even within the boundaries of a parish. Small chapels can also be embedded in monastery buildings, such as a tower. This word can also be understood as being in distinction from the central altar or temple. Here, both words are being used to refer to small temples or chapels that are generally left unlocked in remote areas.

501. Celebrated on March 9.

well as other witnesses, according to whom the Sanctified Bread was also preserved in the homes of Christians and in the cells of monks in order that the faithful might commune daily from it. Perhaps the prohibition of transporting the Presanctified Elements is due to the consideration for preventing various abuses that could perhaps take place if the Holy Eucharist was transported from temple to temple in an unrestricted manner. However, perhaps it has its origins in monastic practice, from which the Liturgy of the Presanctified was derived. Namely, in monasteries, Vespers is celebrated on a daily basis not in a chapel, but in the central temple of the monastery, the katholikon. The Presanctified was always all along associated with Vespers, consequently it was always celebrated in the katholikon and never in chapels; in other words, the need for transporting the Presanctified Bread did not exist de facto. The same taxis also became established in parish temples. The connection with Vespers was preserved and, together with this, like an echo of the monastic practice, its non-transport to another temple was preserved, insofar as this did not take place in monasteries, where the Presanctified was also always celebrated together with Vespers in the central temple of the monastery.

## 81

**When are we able to "take kairos" during the Liturgy of the Presanctified or do we not "take kairos" because the Holy Elements are presanctified?**

During the celebration of the Presanctified, the priest and the deacon (if the Liturgy is celebrated with his participation) do not "take kairos" as in the Liturgies of the sacred Chrysostomos and Basileios the Great. And this is the case because they are not going to celebrate the (complete) Divine Liturgy but are simply going to provide the already Presanctified Gifts for communion. Precisely for this reason, the prayer of the Cherubic hymn, "No one is worthy . . . ,"[502] is also not said, which specifically is a prayer of the Liturgy for the worthy celebration of the mystery (even if one comes upon

502. "Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος . . ."

this or another related prayer in some later manuscripts); as also the prayer said when the priest "takes kairos," "O Lord, stretch forth your hand . . . ,"[503] which is the central point of this small service, has no place as preparatory for the celebration of the Liturgy of the Presanctified.

According to the manuscripts that contain "Explanations"[504] concerning the celebration of the Liturgy of the Presanctified, the priest and the deacon come into the center of the temple "and make three reverences, one [prostration] towards the presider[505] and towards each choir, and so enter the altar." According to others still, "when it is time, the deacon with the priest arrive and make a prostration towards the presider and come into the temple before the beautiful gate and make three prostrations while saying, 'O God, have mercy on me the sinner'[506] and enter the altar and putting on the priestly vestments . . ." or "[the priest] comes before the holy doors prostrating three times while saying, 'O God, have mercy on me the sinner.' Next, he piously kisses the holy icon of Christ and the Theotokos. Then, he enters the holy bēma and does not say anything, but only makes a prostration," or "the priest and the deacon together make a prostration to the abbot or to his stasidion.[507] Also, to each choir, and so, in the center, they make three prostrations and upon entering the sanctuary they put on the customary [vestments]." Namely, according to these witnesses, the "kairos" was taken in a rudimentary and archaic manner, so well-suited to the

503 "Κύριε, ἐξαπόστειλον τὴν χεῖρά σου . . ."

504 "Ἑρμηνεῖες." This word can also be translated as "commentaries."

505 See question 302, for a discussion of the "presider" (προεστώς).

506 "Ὁ Θεός, ἱλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ."

507 "στασίδιον" (pl., "στασίδια," stasidia) This word can be understood as the seat reserved for the abbot. In question 557, Phountoulēs states regarding their construction in modern monasteries, "For the synaxes, the worshipers invented stasidia, which, when properly constructed, such as for example on the Holy Mountain, are a marvel of knowledge of the human body's anatomy. They enable propping up the one praying when he stands upright, supporting him in a half-seated posture, and relaxing him when he is seated." Such seats are also designed to allow the worshipper when seated to rest his or her head on the arm rest.

"shadowy and mournful,"[508] according to Theodōros the Stoudite, character of the Liturgy of the Presanctified; only with a prostration towards the presider (these "Explanations" refer to the celebration of the Presanctified in the holy monasteries) and to the choirs, three prostrations before the beautiful gate in silence or with "O God, have mercy upon me . . . ," and a kissing of the holy icons.

This taxis is preserved traditionally even nowadays on the Holy Mountain and in parish temples, although the printed Hieratika and Euchologia in circulation skip this point, leaving legitimate questions for our priests who happen not to be taught by older priests or happen not to see the Liturgy of the Presanctified celebrated.

Regarding that point of the service during which the priest "takes kairos" in the manner described above, the manuscript "Diataxeis" and "Explanations" of the Liturgy of the Presanctified customarily set the time as either when the "brethren" chant the Ninth Hour or especially after the Beatitudes "at the 'Remember us, O Lord, when you come in your Kingdom,'[509]" or "after 'Remember us, O Lord,'[510] when chanting, 'The heavenly chorus.'[511]" Still other codices vaguely record, "when it is time" or simply "when you are about to celebrate a Presanctified," without a more precise time specified. According to *National Library of Athens 758*, which does not refer to the practice of monasteries but of parishes, the priest read the Third, Sixth, and Ninth Hours "at noontime" by himself, entered the bēma after the service for Communion, prepared the holy prothesis, sounded the bell, and thereafter "took kairos." Nowadays, it has become prevalent for the priest to "take kairos" immediately after the enarxis of the reading of the psalms of the Ninth Hour, so as to be vested in order to cense during the chanting of the Beatitudes or after "O God have compassion on us . . . ."[512] If the priest judges this time insufficient to "take kairos," to vest, and to incense, he can certainly "take kairos" even earlier. The rubrics that determine the Ninth Hour as a time

508. PG 99:1688b.
509. "Μνήσθητι ἡμῶν, Κύριε, ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου."
510. "Μνήσθητι ἡμῶν, Κύριε."
511. "Χορὸς ὁ ἐπουράνιος."
512. "Ὁ Θεὸς οἰκτειρήσαι ἡμᾶς . . ."

for "taking kairos" are monastic, and in the monasteries, besides the fact that a break intervened between the Sixth and Ninth Hours (the Sixth Hour was read together with the Third after 9 a.m. and the Ninth after 3 p.m. together with Vespers and the Presanctified), the Ninth Hour lasted much longer than it lasts nowadays, because the psalms and the troparia that form it were chanted and because the stichologia of the entire kathisma of the Psalter was inserted into it. Consequently, the priest easily had all the time to prepare himself, a matter which with difficulty he perhaps manages to accomplish nowadays.

## 82

**After the betrothal, must "an ektenēs and dismissal" take place, as the Euchologia state, or do we immediately go into the "blesseds"?[513]**

After the last prayer of the service of the betrothal, "O Lord our God, who accompanied the servant of the patriarch Abraham to Mesopotamia . . . ,"[514] and its exclamation, the manuscripts and printed Euchologia record: "next an ektenēs and dismissal" or only "a dismissal." During the period in which this service developed, the betrothal took place most of the time separately from the service of marriage, or even if it took place together, the service of the betrothal was celebrated in the narthēx and that of the crowning before the beautiful gate, as nowadays. Consequently, both in the first and in the second case, the two services were not connected in respect to time, or even place. Therefore, the ektenēs and the dismissal were the natural conclusion of the service of betrothal.

Nowadays, both these services are always celebrated together in the central aisle of the temple. Because of this, the custom is prevalent that the ektenēs and dismissal are omitted that conclude the first service. Although ritual strictness would prescribe that this omis-

513. The "blesseds" (μακαρισμοί) here refer to the chanting of the processional psalm, Ps 127, which begins "Μακάριοι πάντες οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν Κύριον . . ." (Blessed are all who fear the Lord).

514. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τῷ παιδὶ τοῦ Πατριάρχου Ἀβραὰμ συμπορευθεὶς ἐν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ."

sion does not take place, nevertheless other comparative instances in other similar cases demonstrate that a more general rule applies in our case, and consequently, that no innovation is occurring here. Thus, when the Divine Liturgy is attached to the service of Matins, the ektenēs and dismissal that conclude the latter are omitted (they are said "inaudibly"). Similarly, also when the services of the Hours are attached, again they are not separated with a dismissal. And in the service of unction, no one any longer recognizes that its first part, namely up until the apolytikion "Quick to grant your help . . . ,"[515] is separated with an ektenēs and dismissal from the second, which begins from the litany of peace.

In the service of betrothal and marriage, the omission of the ektenēs and dismissal that separates them is attested to already by Symeōn of Thessaloniki. According to him, immediately after the exclamation of the last prayer of the betrothal, which we mentioned, the priest "brings forward [those about to wedded from the narthēx, where the service of betrothal was celebrated] through the middle of the temple . . . right opposite the altar before the holy doors . . . accompanying this while chanting a fitting psalm, 'Blessed are all who fear the Lord'" (*Dialogue*, chapter 278).[516] Therefore, the omission of the ektenēs and dismissal at the end of the service of betrothal can be done in good conscience even by the priest most attentive to strictness, since not only does this contribute to somewhat shortening the service and to not repeating things that will also be repeated at the end of the service of marriage, but also this is quite ancient and consistent with other similar precedents.

## 83

**Which entrance prayer is said during the small entrance when the Vesperal Liturgy of Basileios the Great is celebrated, given that opinions differ?**

The various manuscripts, printed Euchologia, and Hieratika that contain the Liturgy of Basileios the Great do not note exactly which

515. "Ταχὺς εἰς ἀντίληψιν . . ."
516. PG 155:509a. The misprint "268" is corrected.

prayer must be said during the entrance of this Liturgy when it is celebrated connected with Vespers, like on the eves of the Nativity and Theophany, during Great Thursday, and during Great Saturday. However, it is tacitly implied that the entrance prayer of Vespers, "In the evening and in the morning and at noonday . . . ,"[517] will be said, provided that by the end of the Old Testament readings, the customary taxis of Vespers is followed, and the Liturgy of Basileios the Great proper begins from the trisagion hymn. This is also indirectly implied by the Typikon, the Mēnaia, and the Triōdion, when after the gospel reading, they only note stereotypically in well-known examples, "the Liturgy of Basileios the Great and so forth." At any rate, most of our priests say the entrance prayer of Vespers and it is said on the Holy Mountain.

However, it appears that it is more correct for the Liturgy's entrance prayer to be said, which in the Liturgy of Basileios the Great is not different from the entrance prayer of the Liturgy of Chrysostomos ("O Master Lord our God, who established the orders and hosts of angels and archangels in the heavens . . .").[518] And this is the case for the following reasons: First, while this entrance takes place during Vespers, it is an entrance of the Liturgy, for this reason also it is characterized as a "small" entrance, a thing that presupposes that there also exists a "great" entrance, namely, the entrance of the precious gifts, while in Vespers there does not exist either one small or large, but simply an "entrance." Second, the entrance prayer of Vespers is derived from the "asmatic" Vespers, where it constituted the prayer of the eighth antiphon or of the "Lord, I have cried to you,"[519] namely of Psalm 140, during the chanting of which the entrance of Vespers took place. However, the phrases of the prayer, "direct our prayer as incense before You and incline not our hearts unto words or thoughts of evil . . . for unto You O Lord, are our eyes and in You have we hoped,"[520] being gleaned from the

517. "Ἑσπέρας καὶ πρωῒ καὶ μεσημβρίας . . ."

518. "Δέσποτα Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ καταστήσας ἐν οὐρανοῖς τάγματα καὶ στρατιὰς ἀγγέλων καὶ ἀρχαγγέλων . . ."

519. "Κύριε ἐκέκραξα."

520. "κατεύθυνον τὴν προσευχήν ἡμῶν ὡς θυμίαμα ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ μὴ ἐκκλίνῃς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν εἰς λόγους ἢ εἰς λογισμοὺς πονηρίας . . . ὅτι πρὸς σέ,

psalm itself (Ps 140:2, 4, 8), are a clear allusion to the offering of incense that accompanies the entrance of Vespers ("let our prayer be directed as incense before you"),[521] while in our case incense is not offered, but the entrance takes place "with the Gospel book." Third, during the small entrance, the priests enter the sanctuary in order to celebrate the Divine Liturgy. Consequently, the Liturgy's entrance prayer, in which the priest asks to enter together with the angels in order to concelebrate and to glorify the goodness of God, is a more fitting one than the other that refers to entreaties irrelevant to the upcoming Liturgy. Finally, fourth, there exist a few Diataxeis[522] in ancient Typika, from which one could conclude with certainty that they attest in favor of the prayer's reading, "Master Lord our God...."[523] Thus, the ancient "asmatic" Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople that is preserved in the *Codex Patmos 266* from the ninth–tenth century, expressly states, that during the Liturgy of Great Thursday, "the Liturgy's entrance prayer takes place and the Patriarch enters with the Gospel book without censers and candlesticks, and ascends the synthronon."[524] The *Sinaiticus Kanonarion* of the tenth–eleventh century (*Codex Sinai 150*) and the Typikon of the year 1292, which is contained in *Vatican Library 1877*, prescribe two entrances during the first part of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great on Great Saturday; the first is the "entrance of Vespers" before the readings, and the second, after the chanting of the eighth ode ("Bless ye all the works of the Lord, the Lord...")[525] and before the trisagion. During this second entrance, the "entrance prayer of the

---

Κύριε, οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν καὶ σοὶ ἠλπίσαμεν."

521. "κατεύθυνον τὴν προσευχὴν ἡμῶν ὡς θυμίαμα ἐνώπιόν σου."

522. The capitalized word, "Διατάξεις," could indicate the liturgical book of the Διάταξις (Diataxis), which contained rubrics for various services, or a similarly named section of the Typikon appearing before texts of the Presanctified. For information on the liturgical book of the Diataxis, see Robert Taft, "Diataxis," *ODB* 1:619.

523. "Δέσποτα Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ."

524. Juan Mateos, ed. and trans., *Le Typicon de la Grande Église. Ms. Sainte-Croixe n°. 40, X^e siècle. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes*, OCA 165 and 166 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1962–1963), 2:74–75.

525. "Εὐλογεῖτε πάντα τὰ ἔργα Κυρίου τὸν Κύριον . . ."

Liturgy" was said. The insertion of the second entrance shows that according to these Typika the "small entrance" and its prayer were viewed as an essential element for the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy. Finally, more explicit is the rubric that happens to be in the Typikon of the Monastery of Saint Nikolaos of Casole[526] of the twelfth–thirteenth century with respect to the Vespers and the Liturgy of the eve of Theophany: "One must know that, when there is a fast [namely, when the eve of Theophany does not fall on Saturday or Sunday, consequently during the Vespers of the feast, the Liturgy of Basileios the Great is celebrated], the priest says the prayer, 'O Master Lord our God, who established in the heavens . . . '[527] at the entrance of the Liturgy, but when there is not a fast [namely, when the eve falls on Saturday or Sunday and the Vespers is celebrated without the Liturgy], the prayer of the entrance of Lamp-lighting, 'In the evening and in the morning . . .'[528] The entrance takes place . . . ."[529]

The Vespers in these cases did not constitute an independent service, to which the Divine Liturgy is attached, as takes place with the service of Matins on feasts or with the services of Third and Sixth Hours in monasteries but is interwoven in some manner with the Liturgy and constitutes its first part, like the antiphons in the regular Liturgy. For this reason, also, the priest "takes kairos" before the enarxis of the entire service, asking through the prayer to be

526. The monastery (Ἡ μονὴ τοῦ ἁγίου Νικολάου τῶν Κασούλων) was founded in 1098/99 under the patronage of Bohemund, prince of Taranto and Antioch. The Typikon is dated 1173. Recent scholarship is summarized by Mattia C. Chiriatti, "El Typikón de Sant Nicolás de Casole: un monasterio, un scriptorium, y una bibliotheca," *Estudios bizantinos* 4 (2016): 107–121. For an edition of the Typikon, see A. Apostolidis, *Il typikon di S. Nicola di Casole secondo il codice Taur. Gr. C III 17* (Ph.D. Thesis, Ponticia Università S. Tommaso D'Aquino in Roma, 1984). For additional analysis of this Typikon, see Barbara Crostini and Ines Angeli Murzaku, eds., *Greek Monasticism in Southern Italy: The Life of Neilos in Context* (London: Routledge, 2018). General information on the monastery and the portion of its Typikon related to dietary rule can be found in Thomas and Hero, 4:1319–1330.

527. "Δέσποτα Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ καταστήσας ἐν οὐρανοῖς . . ."

528. "Ἑσπέρας καὶ πρωΐ . . ."

529. A. Apostolidis, *Il typikon di S. Nicola di Casole secondo il codice Taur. Gr. C III 17* (Ph.D. Thesis, Ponticia Università S. Tommaso D'Aquino in Roma, 1984), 99.

strengthened by the Lord's mighty hand in order to perform "the bloodless sacred-service," vests before its enarxis, and blesses with "Blessed is the Kingdom,"[530] as in the regular Liturgy and not with "Blessed is our God,"[531] as in the Vespers. The example of the entrance prayer of the Liturgy of the Presanctified, which is the prayer of Vespers, "In the evening and in the morning . . . ," cannot constitute an argument also for a similar practice in a conjoined Vesperal Liturgy of Basileios the Great, because in the former this is properly speaking not about a celebration of a Liturgy, but of a Vespers with an offering of the Presanctified Elements for communion of the faithful.

## 84

**Is it typically considered an unpardonable omission when, to avoid various improprieties, the rite of the Resurrection is not celebrated outside of the sacred temple, but inside of it?**[532]

Throughout all the ancient and modern Typika, the service of the Resurrection is celebrated outside of the temple "at the appointed place" or in the narthēx before the closed royal gates of the temple. This is explained either as a remnant of the ancient practice of parish temples, in which the first part of the service of the "asmatic" Matins was chanted in a similar manner in the narthēx and afterwards the entrance into the temple took place, or more likely, in order in this way for the Lord's Resurrection to be represented more graphically, which occurred from His tomb that was in the middle of a garden (John 19:41, 20:15), or for humanity's passage from earth (= narthēx) to heaven (= temple) by the Lord's Resurrection.

The disorder that might occur, perhaps during the exit and the entrance again of the faithful into the temple, or the various improprieties that take place in our land[533] during the celebration of the Resurrection, which certainly would not occur if it was celebrated

530. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία."
531. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός . . ."
532. In Greece, the "improprieties" (ἔκτροπα) being referenced include the throwing of firecrackers, sometimes even in the direction of the priest.
533. Greece.

mainly in the temple, is not a forceful enough reason for anyone to contemplate the revision of this ancient and beautiful custom. Even more improprieties took place in the past. The civilizing of morals, the raising of our people's social level, and their religious growth has gradually reduced these (improprieties), and, with the passage of time, the situation will even improve more. Only in cases of extraordinary necessity, such as during war and occupation, was the celebration of the service of the Resurrection inside temples prescribed by exception.

## 85

**The final prayer of the service of the fortieth day states "and vouchsafe it [the child][534] in due time also regeneration through water and Spirit . . . ,"[535] and the standard rubric a little further below prescribes "And he brings it into the altar if it might be a male . . . ." Since from the prayer above it appears that the child is unbaptized, how is its entrance into the altar permitted?[536]**

According to Symeōn of Thessaloniki, "If the baby is baptized, he even brings it into the altar and carries it around in a circle, while also making an act of reverence, revealing it as an offering to God, he also worships the creator. Regarding the child who is not yet baptized, after standing before the pillars,[537] making an act of rev-

534. Translator's insertion.

535. "καὶ καταξίωσον αὐτὸ ἐν καιρῷ εὐθέτῳ καὶ τῆς δι' ὕδατος καὶ Πνεύματος ἀναγεννήσεως . . ."

536. Compare also questions 363 and 379–381.

537. "τὰ διάστυλα." Compare also in *Explanation of the Divine Temple,* where Symeōn states, "By means of the curtain in the sanctuary it typifies the heavenly tabernacle round about God, where the hosts of angels and the repose of the saints are. By means of the chancel screen, or the pillars (διὰ δὲ τῶν κιγκλίδων, ἤτοι τῶν διαστύλων), it represents the difference between sensible and spiritual realities," (translation taken from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika,* 90–91). If taken as the pillars of the chancel screen, the use of the term, "τὰ διάστυλα," could also be referring to the space between the columns in the chancel screen before the altar table. See the discussion of term's definition as "sanctuary enclosure" in Nicholas Constas, "Symeon of Thessalonike and the Theology of the Icon Screen," in *Thresholds of the Sacred: Architectural, Art Historical, Liturgical, and Theological Perspectives on Religious Screens, East and West,* ed. S.E. J. Gerstel (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 2006), 170.

erence with the baby in the sanctuary, and giving it to the mother, he makes a dismissal" (*Dialogue*, chapter 60).[538] However, Symeōn is the only one who attests that such a distinction existed during his era regarding unbaptized infants. All the manuscripts that contain the service—which, it should be noted, not only in the final prayer, but also in two others, the first and the third, presuppose that the child is unbaptized—speak about the bringing of the babies into the sanctuary as well, indeed most times irrespective of gender. Nowadays, only males are brought into the sanctuary, whether baptized or not. The meaning of the service of the churching of babies is that they are presented to God and offered to Him. Therefore, even if the practice that is attested to by Symeōn does not have rational support, it would not be appropriate for such a hair-splitting distinction to be raised, since the entrance into the altar has the meaning of dedicating the baby in the temple and of an act of reverence and does not take place at the time when the Divine Liturgy is celebrated.

## 86

**Is it correct that the rite of the Resurrection is celebrated during the hours after midnight of Great Saturday into Sunday in accordance with the gospel ("When the Sabbath was past . . . very early on the first day of the week . . . when the sun had risen")[539] and to avoid the abandonment of the temple by the faithful after the Resurrection?[540]**

During the night of Pascha virtually from the first years of the Christian Church, a long all-night service was celebrated, which began from the Vespers of Saturday and concluded on Sunday morning. This is the most ancient Christian all-night vigil.[541] According to the Byzantine liturgical Typikon, it contained the Ves-

538. PG 155:212a–212b.

539. Mark 16:1–2.

540. "Resurrection" here means the rite of the Resurrection. One of the problems raised is the departure of the faithful before the celebration of the Paschal Divine Liturgy in the Church of Greece and in other Greek-speaking churches of the diaspora.

541. "ἡ παννυχίς."

pers of Great Saturday (during the readings of which the baptism of catechumens took place), the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, a long reading of the Acts of the Apostles, the Midnight Office of the Sunday of Pascha (in which the canon of Great Saturday "In the waves of the sea"[542] is chanted instead of the customary trinitarian canon), the service of Matins, and the Resurrectional Liturgy. In parishes for pastoral reasons, the long service was split into two and the Vespers with the Liturgy of Basileios the Great was transferred to the morning of Great Saturday in order to facilitate the communion of the faithful, the baptism of the catechumens ceased to be celebrated any longer, the long reading of the Acts that connected the Liturgy of Basileios the Great with the Midnight Office no longer took place, and the service of the all-night vigil was limited only to the Midnight Office, Matins, and Liturgy. The service of the Resurrection in the liturgical framework of these services is found after the dismissal of the Midnight Office and at the beginning of Matins, of which it also constitutes the enarxis in a peculiar sort of way. Precisely this liturgical position of the service of the Resurrection implied that it was celebrated during the first hours after midnight, namely at the time when the usual service of Matins also began. In any case, certain ancient Typika expressly prescribed with characteristic phrases, "when the appropriate time of Matins begins [or comes] we go forth," and so forth, or "around the time of Matins," as the Typikon of the printed Pentēkostarion notes. Moreover, other Typika placed the enarxis of the service of the Resurrection after the eighth or after the ninth hour of the night, namely roughly past two or three after midnight. Others place it a few hours before. According to them, the dismissal of the service prior to the Resurrection took place roughly at the sixth hour of the night, namely, at midnight. Despite all the diversity that the witnesses of these ancient Typika present at first glance, it is characteristic that they agree in that the Resurrection occurs after midnight and even before the night begins to abate, namely, "while very early"[543] of Sunday. This practice

542. "Κύματι θαλάσσης."
543. Luke 24:1.

is explained by a later (of the year 1813) manuscript Typikon of the Monastery of Philotheou of Mount Athos as follows: "the sixth hour must be past when the Resurrection takes place, because our Lord was resurrected after midnight." However, another tradition also existed in parallel that the Lord was resurrected at midnight. For example, in the synaxarion of the Sunday of Pascha, which is contained in the Pentēkostarion and which is written by Nikēphoros Xanthopoulos,[544] it is stated that "about the middle of the night" the angel came down and rolled the stone from the tomb. This tradition, as well as the tendency for the end of the service to be expedited, also influenced the present practice and the Resurrection is celebrated precisely at midnight. Despite this, still even in certain areas of our fatherland,[545] they celebrate the Resurrection after midnight at 3:00 in the morning, namely at the ninth hour of the night, as we saw in some ancient Typika.[546] This does not only take place for reasons of necessity, namely when a priest services two villages, but also under normal circumstances, in accordance with ancient tradition.[547]

It is true that the celebration of the service of the Resurrection at midnight has two unfortunate consequences: the departure of many Christians almost immediately after it and the hasty celebration of the Resurrection Matins and Divine Liturgy. We are talking about two ancient maladies that are difficult to treat. The Divine Liturgy of the Resurrection was celebrated hastily even at the end of the fourth century in the Holy Places, at the time when the pilgrim Aetheria the Moor visited them and described the services

544. Nikēphoros Xanthopoulos (d. ca. 1335) was a priest of Saint Sophia, made significant contributions to hymnology, the interpretation of liturgical texts, as well as the composition of prayers and synaxaria, and wrote a church history, the surviving text of which extends to the seventh century, see Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959), 705–706.

545. Greece.

546. As an observation, in the past, Old Calendarists in Greece would time the celebration of the Resurrection service at 1:00 a.m. instead of midnight to reflect their rejection of daylight savings time.

547. This would not mean that the priest celebrates two Liturgies when serving two villages but that he would celebrate two Resurrection services while performing the Divine Liturgy for Pascha once in only one of the villages.

that were celebrated there in her *Peregrinatio Aetheriae.*[548] Moreover, many faithful were never well-disposed towards attending the entire Paschal vigil. This does not mean that we also should stop working towards the removal of both these improprieties, the remedy of which is dependent firstly on the priests themselves. Conscientious Christians who are suitably catechized by the priest will leave the temple after the Resurrection with difficulty and only for a serious reason, and the drowsy and hasty celebration of the remainder of the service can with a little good will, effort, and zeal, give way to a bright festive sacred celebration, worthy of the great feast, always within reasonable time limits. I do not know if only the transfer of the whole service after midnight could bring about any essential improvement of the situation because the somewhat indolent Christians still will have difficulties in attending the long service after midnight. Outside of this, the celebration of the Resurrection Service at midnight has become a fixed custom. In this way, even though truncated, the ancient great Paschal all-night vigil is preserved.

548. This fourth century writing is a travelogue of a woman's pilgrimage to Palestine, Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor. The writing is divided into two parts: a diary of the pilgrimage and a description of services in Jerusalem. Phountoulēs's attribution and titling of this work (*Ὁδοιπορικὸν τῆς Αἰθερίας, Peregrinatio* of Aetheria) reflect the scholarly discussion at the time of his writing. Current scholarship predominantly attributes authorship to a writer known as Egeria and titles the work *Itinerarium Egeriae.* Speculation regarding the author's homeland includes Aquitaine, Gallia Narbonensis, southern Gaul, and Galicia. Aside from recently discovered fragments, the work is contained in one surviving eleventh century manuscript, the *Codex Aretinus 405.* This discussion is based on Anne McGowan and Paul F. Bradshaw, trans., *The Pilgrimage of Egeria, A New Translation of the Itinerarium Egeriae with Introduction and Commentary* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press Academic, 2018) and George E. Gingras, trans., *Egeria: Diary of a Pilgrimage,* Ancient Christian Writers, no. 38 (New York: Newman Press, 1970). Additional information may be found in John Wilkinson, trans., *Egeria's Travels,* 3rd ed. (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1999) and Victor Parra-Guinaldo, "Itinerarium Egeriae: A Retrospective Look and Preliminary Study of a New Approach to the Issue of Authorship-provenance," *Linguistics and Literature Studies* 7 (2019): 13–21.

## 87

**After the three immersions and emersions of the baptized and his/her reception by the sponsor, must the sponsor wait with the baptized in his/her hands while the Thirty-First Psalm, the prayer of the myron, the anointing with the myron, epistle, gospel reading, prayers of washing, and prayers of tonsure are read, or must the priest read them beforehand at an opportune time, such as when they undress the catechumen or when they anoint him/her with oil, and leaving only "Seal of the gift,"[549] "You are justified,"[550] "He/She is tonsured"[551] and "Have mercy on us"[552] with the dismissal?[553]**

The celebration of the service of holy baptism presents a multitude of problems, which to solve them our priests are forced to improvise or to follow their local traditions, since the Church never saw fit to pen authentic guidelines, as done with other mysteries and sacred rites, such as the consecration of temples, the funeral service, and so forth. But the cause of all these difficulties is the fact that the service of baptism, as found nowadays in our Euchologia, maintains an ancient form and assumes two presuppositions that no longer exist today and will not be brought back in the future. The first is baptism at an adult age and the second, the separation of the many individual services from which the present service of baptism is composed. And first, in the standard rubrics of this service, many times there is a reference regarding "a baby," "an infant," or "a child," but the service in its basic lines, remains in the form that it had in the era when infant baptism had not yet completely become prevalent. Thus, presently for reasons of protecting the health of the baby, its undressing cannot be prolonged any longer than a few minutes, while the service presupposes the chanting of an entire psalm and the reading of a relatively long prayer from the unclothing until the application of chrism, apart from the time indispensably required for the anointing

549. "Σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς."
550. "Ἐδικαιώθης."
551. "Κείρεται τὴν κόμην."
552. "Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς."
553. This question refers to infant baptism, not the initiation of adults.

with the oil of exorcism, the baptism, and the chrismation. Second, the service of baptism, as it is nowadays, encompasses at least six individual rites, which during the most ancient period were separate from each other and certainly on different days. In the very section of the service that the question refers to, a part of the service of baptism, the mystery of chrismation, the remnants of the Divine Liturgy (together with which baptism was celebrated), the washing, and the tonsure have been compressed. Precisely the multitude of these rites creates an impasse in the completion of the entire service and solutions given are, for the most part, at the expense of the strict and sacredly befitting celebration of the great mystery, which in this way was restricted to its most impressive points. Different attempts at adapting the service of baptism also took place earlier and we detect their traces in many manuscripts, even in Symeōn of Thessaloniki (*Dialogue*, chapters 61–68).

The better, or at any rate, the least bad, solution that is given and followed by most priests is the following: after the threefold immersion, chrismation is immediately conferred without the prayer that accompanies it ("Blessed are You, O Lord God, Pantokratōr, the source of good things . . ."[554]), the tonsure takes place, without again its two prayers ("O Master, Lord our God, You have honored man with your image . . ."[555] and "O Lord our God, Who through the fullness of the font . . ."[556]), and the clothing of the newly illumined with the main baptismal garments, the chitōn and koukoulion, follows while "Grant to me a shining chitōn . . ."[557] is chanted and the infant is taken away. The entire Thirty-First Psalm is chanted next ("Blessed are those whose transgressions were forgiven . . .")[558] or traditionally the katabasies of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross or of Pascha, if it is the Paschal period. Thus, time is allowed for those present to dress the baby, and for the priest to wash and to read the

554. "Εὐλογητὸς εἶ, Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ἡ πηγὴ τῶν ἀγαθῶν . . ."

555. "Δέσποτα Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τῇ εἰκόνι σου τιμήσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον . . ."

556. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος τῆς κολυμβήθρας . . ."

557. "Χιτῶνά μοι παράσχου φωτεινόν . . ." The word "χιτῶν" is often translated as "robe" for the purpose of chanting the hymn in English. However, throughout this translation, it will be retained as "chitōn."

558 "Μακάριοι, ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι . . ."

prayers that were omitted, namely of the chrismation and of the tonsuring. In this way, after the return of the child, there remains "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ . . . ,"[559] the readings, the ektenēs, and the washing with the three prayers that accompany it. However, usually the two first prayers of the washing are read before, together with the preceding ones, and only the third prayer, "He that has put on you, O Christ . . . ,"[560] remains at the end of the service. It would perhaps be correct for the second prayer of tonsuring to be left in order to be read at the end of the entire service, since it presupposes the presence of the infant and beautifully concludes all the baptismal rites by the blessing of the head of the newly illumined. At any rate, the prayers cannot or must not be said at the time of the baby's undressing because this occurs at the time of the consecration of the water, or its anointing with the oil of exorcism, and because it would be to the detriment of this beautiful and so symbolic point of the service and of the prayers, which by necessity would be said hurriedly at that time and without anyone paying attention.

It is pointless for us to write that in the Euchologion a completely different taxis is provided for: Baptism, Thirty-First Psalm, clothing, prayer of chrismation, anointing, "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ,"[561] readings, ektenēs, three prayers of washing, washing ("on the eighth day"[562] from baptism), two prayers of tonsuring, and tonsuring. At any rate, it would be wonderful sometime for the service of baptism to obtain the particular attention of the Church and, afterwards, to be decongested from the multitude of prebaptismal and postbaptismal rites, which can be celebrated separately, for the central rite of holy baptism alone to remain, to be celebrated with all the ease and brilliance that befits it, indeed united with the Divine Liturgy, as in the classical period of the Christian Church. In this way, the first communion of the baby would not pass scarcely unnoticed but would be according to the

559. "Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστόν . . ."
560. "Ὁ ἐνδυσάμενος (ἡ ἐνδυσαμένη) σέ . . ."
561. "Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε . . ."
562. "τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ."

teachings of the Church and the words of Symeōn of Thessaloniki, "the completion of every mystery"[563] and the climax of Christian initiation.

## 88

**Some priests are accustomed after the service of the Resurrection[564] to say before the closed gates of the temple, "Raise up the gates, O rulers of yours . . ."[565] and enter afterwards into it. Namely, the temple represents Hades, into which Christ descended. Is it not blasphemy to consider the temple Hades and a place of Satan?**

The dialogue, "Raise up the gates, O rulers of yours . . . Who is this King of Glory . . ." and so forth,[566] is taken from the last verses (7–10) of the Twenty-Third Psalm. These verses were interpreted sometimes by the Fathers as a dialogue of the King of Glory, namely, of the Lord, or of the angels that accompanied Him, with Hades or with the powers of darkness during the Descent of Christ into Hades, but at other times as a dialogue of the Lord with angels or a dialogue of the angels who serve the Lord with other angels, who were found in the heavens, or a dialogue of the Holy Spirit with angels during the Ascension of the Lord. According to the apocryphal *Gospel of Nikodēmos*, the dialogue took place during the entrance of Christ into Hades.[567] In Christian hymnography, we find echoes of the patristic interpretations and of the *Gospel of*

563. "τὸ τέλος μυστηρίου παντός," (PG 155:233b).

564. In the question, the "service of the Resurrection" is being used to mean the rite that is celebrated outside of the temple involving the gospel reading and proclamation of the Resurrection.

565. "Ἄρατε Πύλας, οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν . . ."

566. "Ἄρατε Πύλας, οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν . . . Τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ Βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης . . ."

567. For a critical edition of this apocryphal text, see Rémi Gounelle, *Les recensions byzantines de l'Évangile de Nicodème*, Corpus Christianorum. Series Apochryphorum, Instrumenta, 3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), 310–311. Compare the translation in Bart D. Ehrman and Zlatko Pleše, *The Apocryphal Gospels, Texts and Translations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2911), 483. See question 228 for a quotation of the relevant passages.

*Nikodēmos* in the services of Pascha, Sundays, the Ascension, and the Dormition of the Theotokos.

During the celebration of the consecration of the temple, as we all know, this dialogue is said between the hierarchs and one clergyman. In this case, it has the meaning of the taking of the temple by the King of Glory and the defeat and expulsion of the adverse powers by Him. In earlier times, it was also said during commemorations for the consecrations of temples, which were celebrated annually on the day of their consecration. However, this dialogue was not only said at these times. According to ancient Byzantine Euchologia and Typika, during the return of various religious processions to the temple, "Raise up the gates" was repeated before its gates. Likewise, in ancient Euchologia, there exists evidence that the dialogue was also said from the beautiful gate of the sanctuary between celebrants during the passage of not only the great, but also of the small entrance. In all these cases, one cannot seriously maintain that the temple or even the holy bēma was considered Hades. To be sure, it must be associated with the second patristic interpretation and be seen as a dialogue, before the entrance of heaven, between the Lord and the angels or of the angels among themselves.

These preliminaries are necessary in order that we grasp the meaning of the analogous practice also during the service of the Resurrection. After the dismissal of the service of the Midnight Office, throughout all the Typika, the priests and all the people go out into the narthēx or "to the appointed place" where the service of the Resurrection is about to be celebrated. In the temple, which up until that time remained darkened, only the sexton[568] remains, who, after he closes the royal gates, lights all the candles as well as the candelabra and fills the temple with incense. The rite of the Resurrection presents many variations that do not interest us here. In any case, its present form is less attested to. According to its earlier taxis, which is encountered in many manuscripts, it did not contain a gospel reading or litany of peace. It began with censing and with "Glory to

568. ὁ νεωκόρος.

the holy and consubstantial . . . ,"[569] and "Christ is risen . . ."[570] was chanted alone and with its verses, pretty much also like nowadays. In the middle of the last "Christ is risen," which was chanted by the priest "with a louder-sounding voice," the royal gates, closed until that moment, were sealed with the censer in the form of a cross and opened, and the procession entered while "and granting life to those in the tombs" was chanted. As customary, the litany of peace was said inside the temple. Only in a few manuscripts does the new form of the service appear; the litany of peace was outside and the entrance took place in the same way, but while chanting, "It is the day of the Resurrection . . . ."[571] In both cases, the meaning that is given to the entrance is obvious; Christ through His Resurrection opens up the entrance of heaven or of paradise, closed up until that time, to the race of humankind, and conveys them from the earth, which is represented by the narthēx according to the commentators of divine worship, to heaven, the symbol of which, according to the same commentators, is the dwelling place of God on earth, the temple, already illuminated and full of the sweet-smelling smoke of the incense.

In the Typikon of the Monastery of the Evergetis (*Codex National Library of Athens 788* from the twelfth century), the first attempt of the combination of this entrance with psalmic verse is encountered, again in connection with "Christ is risen": "'Open to me gates of righteousness, when I enter in them, I will acknowledge the Lord.'[572] 'And to those in the tombs.' And inside, the assistant sacristans[573] or even the sacristan[574] himself immediately opens, and the people chant 'Christ is risen' and [the priest] enters . . . ."[575] The "Raise up

569. "Δόξα τῇ ἁγίᾳ, καὶ ὁμοουσίῳ . . ."

570. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη . . ."

571. "Ἀναστάσεως ἡμέρα . . ."

572. "Ἀνοίξατέ μοι πύλας δικαιοσύνης, εἰσελθὼν ἐν αὐταῖς ἐξομολογήσομαι τῷ Κυρίῳ" (Psalm 117:19).

573. οἱ παρεκκλησιάρχαι.

574. ὁ ἐκκλησιάρχης.

575. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 506–509. Phountoulēs did not continue with the quotation to include the word, "priest."

the gates" still not as a dialogue, but only as a verse of "Christ is risen," occurs for the first time, at least as far as I know, in the manuscript Typikon of the Sinai Monastery under number 1097 from the year 1214: "The priest, 'Glory both now,' with a louder-sounding voice, 'Christ is risen.' The priest, 'Raise up the gates, O rulers of yours,' 'Christ is risen,' and when the gates open, he enters . . . ." As a dialogue, more in its full form as in the consecration, it is found in a Typikon of Saint Sabas from the sixteenth century (*Patriarchate of Jerusalem 311*): "Next again the priest begins, 'Christ is risen,' with a louder-sounding voice, and the presider[576] begins and strikes three times, the gates being shut, and saying, 'Raise up the gates, O rulers.' The lamplighter[577] inside of the church near the gateway replies and says, 'Who is this King of Glory?' twice. The presider again, 'Lord of powers, He is the King of Glory,'[578] and immediately it is opened. And the gates being opened, he enters . . . and they chant, 'And to those in the tombs.'" However, this custom is much more ancient. According to the attestation of Pseudo-Kōdinos, *Peri offikialiōn* (chapter 4),[579] a work of the mid-fourteenth century (1347–1355), in Saint Sophia of Constantinople the prōtopappas opened the doors after the service of the Resurrection according to the more ancient way, namely without the dialogue. However, it attests that "in many of the churches" the custom already existed that the gates of the temples are opened with, "Raise up the gates." And this dialogue was not included in printed liturgical books because, as we have seen, it is encountered in less manuscripts. Only in the Hieratikon of Rome's press (1950) is it found together with a special litany of peace, with the note that "in certain places it is a custom" to be inserted in the service of the Resurrection.[580] However, this practice (which in some

576. "ὁ προεστώς." See question 302 for a discussion of this term.

577. "ὁ κανδηλανάπτης."

578. "Κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης."

579. Pseudo-Kōdinos, *De Officiis* 4 in *Pseudo-Kodinos and the Constantinopolitan Court: Offices and Ceremonies*, ed. and trans. R. Macrides, J.A. Munitz, and D. Angelov (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2013), 182–183. In the translation above, the incorrect reference to chapter 14 is corrected.

580. *Ἱερατικὸν περιέχον τὰς Ἀκολουθίας τοῦ Ἑσπερινοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ὄρθρου, τὰς θείας καὶ ἱερὰς Λειτουργίας Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου, Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου καὶ τῶν Προηγιασμένων, μετὰ τῶν συνήθων προσθηκῶν* (Rome: n.p., 1950), 78–79.

places is associated with the return of the epitaphios during the procession of the Matins of Great Saturday)[581] is more widespread than commonly thought.

The reaction against it is fairly old, and precisely for the reason that the question mentions. The temple and Hades are two incompatible things. Thus, in the Typikon that is contained in manuscript number 1108 of the Sinai Monastery from the fifteenth century, at the point that the manner of entering the temple after the Resurrection is prescribed, a whole indictment is inserted against those who observe this custom, which also would not be a few, as it seems from the way that the author of the Typikon inveighs against them: "Next, a great synaptē, and after the exclamation, he says immediately the canon, 'It is the day of the Resurrection,' and entering into the church while not at all speaking, although some ignorant ones say, 'Raise up the gates,' and another also answers, 'Who is this King of Glory'; for these things are incongruous with the power of God because we give license and power to the devil and because they oppose and speak against God, the creator of all things existing and even the demons themselves." With the same spirit, a similar commentary was written in the past also in *Ἐφημέριος* (Volume 2, 1953, p. 284).[582] From what we wrote above, these things appear to be quite unjust. This form of celebrating the Resurrection is simply a development upon the grandeur of the more ancient simple usage, namely, of the opening of the gates with the sealing in the form of a cross while chanting, "Christ is risen." The meaning of the entrance with, "Raise up the gates," although it is not irrelevant to the victory of Christ over Hades as it is presented in the *Gospel of Nikodēmos* and Resurrection hymnography, must be sought in the second way of patristic interpretation of these verses of the Twenty-Third Psalm, in combination with the meaning that the opening of the gates had before the introduction of, "Raise up the gates." The Lord, who is represented by the priest, already victor over death and Hades, triumphantly opens the gates of heaven and enters in it together with his people delivered by the Resurrection. And the dialogue is

581. See question 228.

582. Ἐμμ. Γ. Μυτιληναῖος, "Λύσεις Ἀποριῶν," *Ἐφημέριος* 2 (1953): 284.

entered into between the King of Glory and the powers of heaven or the Cherubim that guards the entrance of paradise. This rite had the same meaning also in the return of processions, by which perhaps the Resurrection procession was influenced, and in the entrances of the Liturgy. If this takes place well, where it continues to be celebrated, it can impart much magnificence and splendor to the entire rite.

## 89

**If the sacred mystery of baptism might precede the fortieth day, on the day of the completion of the period of forty days from the birth must we follow the sacred service as contained in the Euchologion?**

The service of the fortieth day has been prescribed in imitation of the bringing of the baby Jesus to the temple on the fortieth day from His birth, when "the days of purification were fulfilled" of the most holy Theotokos (Luke 2:22–39) in accordance with the corresponding legislation of the Mosaic Law (Lev 12:2–8). But this has a dual purpose: the ritualistic purification of the woman who has given birth, according to the relevant Judaic practice that influenced the Christian one, and the introduction of the baby to the temple, his/her "churching."[583] And as regards the first point, the baptism of the baby must not have any effect on conducting the service, since even if it had died, according to the relevant standard rubric, which is inserted at the first prayer, the woman who has given birth would come to the temple and would have the customary prayers. As regards the second point, the matter presents difficulties. For one thing, this service presupposes that the baby is entering the church for the first time, "to appear before God." But if it has been baptized, the bringing has already taken place, since it was baptized in the temple and communed of the Mysteries. Likewise, also, the relevant verses of the prayers, that refer to the baby, always make mention regarding the baptism that will follow and view his/her current consecration as a prestep and prefiguration of his/her final and true con-

583. "ἐκκλησιασμό."

secration to God that will take place through holy baptism. Even the relevant standard rubric that prefaces the service speaks concerning the presence of the sponsor, "who is about to receive him/her as a sponsor through holy baptism." From all this, it appears clear that this service and the prayers that it contains have meaning when located in the framework of prebaptismal rites, where they present a progressive path "of initiation" of the newly born Christian. He/She is blessed on the first day, is given his/her name and is brought forth, but only before the gates of the temple on the eighth day, enters the temple on the fortieth day, and is consecrated to God so that "in due time" the exorcism, the "renunciation" of Satan, the "joining" with Christ, the "regeneration by water and Spirit," and the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ that seals all these things might follow. Moreover, these services are also found in this order in our Euchologia. Consequently, in the period during which the service of the fortieth day was composed and in the spirit that is expressed by it, the celebration of baptism prior to it is present only as an exception that is dictated by reasons of special need. This is also implied by the rubric that prescribes the prayer of the eighth day, where it advises the expediting of baptism only in a case of endangerment of the baby's life and "in order that he/she might not die unillumined."[584] And up until nowadays, in our Church, this custom is prevalent. Rarely, and only on account of sickness, are babies baptized before the fortieth day.

However, if the reasons for the exception are met and the child is baptized before the fortieth day, would the service of the fortieth day be celebrated? Despite the inversion that is created, the service must be celebrated, and the baby brought into the temple in order for him/her to imitate also the bringing of the Lord, and he/she and the woman who has given birth are churched. Nevertheless, it would be absurd that the prayers of the fortieth day be read as they are in the Euchologia at those points that speak regarding the future baptism. The manuscripts, as well as many printed Euchologia, do not deal with this special case because they presuppose the baby to be

584. "Ἵνα μὴ τελευτήσῃ ἀφώτιστον."

unbaptized. Moreover, Symeōn of Thessaloniki (*Dialogue*, chapter 60)[585] makes a distinction between baptized and unbaptized only with regard to the entrance into the altar. During his era, unbaptized children irrespective of gender were not brought into the altar, while those who had received holy baptism again irrespective of gender were brought into the sanctuary and carried around the holy table in a circle (see also the answer to question eighty-five). Symeōn does not speak in detail about the prayers. Some modern printed Euchologia note that in the cases where the baby is baptized, the following sentences are omitted or adapted. In the first prayer, "O Lord God, Pantokratōr, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . ."[586] the phrase is omitted, "that he/she may be vouchsafed the noetic light at the time which you have ordained and may be numbered among your holy flock."[587] In the third prayer, "O Lord our God, who on the fortieth day . . . ,"[588] the phrase "that once he/she has been vouchsafed to receive holy baptism"[589] is adapted to "that, through holy baptism which he/she has been vouchsafed to receive,"[590] or it is omitted. Concerning the fourth prayer, it is noted: "if the child is baptized, we do not say the prayer, 'O God, the Father the Pantokratōr,'[591] or we omit the following, 'and vouchsafe him/her in due time'[592] up to 'unto the name of your Christ.'[593]" Furthermore, these adjustments are also imposed by logic.

When the baptism happens to be set on the fortieth day, then certainly the service of the fortieth day must precede and its prayers are said as they are in the Euchologia without any modification.

---

585. PG 155:209a–212b.

586. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ Πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . ."

587. "ἵνα καὶ τοῦ νοητοῦ καταξιωθῇ φωτὸς ἐν καιρῷ ᾧ ὥρισας καὶ συγκαταριθμηθῇ τῇ ἁγίᾳ σου ποίμνῃ."

588. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐν τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέραις . . ."

589. "ἵνα καταξιωθὲν τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος."

590. "ἵνα διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, οὗ κατηξιώθη."

591. "'Ο Θεός, ὁ Πατὴρ ὁ παντοκράτωρ."

592. "καὶ καταξίωσον αὐτὸ ἐν καιρῷ."

593. "τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου."

## 90

**Why do the prayers for the making of a catechumen not begin with "Blessed is our God,"[594] while at the end of the prayers for the making of a catechumen, namely, after the prayer, "Master, Lord our God, call your servant . . .,"[595] the Euchologion says "dismissal"?**

## 91

**Must a dismissal occur after the catechesis, or do we go immediately into the rite of baptism?**

The prayer "for the making of a catechumen"[596] together with the exorcisms that follow it, the renunciation and joining, the confession of faith, and the last prayer are all said together nowadays, and we could characterize them as one single service that precedes the service of holy baptism. Since we are used to the customary form of Byzantine services that begin with the blessing of God and conclude with a dismissal, the fact appears somewhat strange to us that this service does not also fit into the same liturgical structure. However, the historical development of this section of our Euchologion accounts for the somewhat anomalous form of this "service." Originally, this was not about one service, but many independent elements of the initiation of catechumens. Neither was the prayer "for making a catechumen" read before baptism, nor did the exorcisms take place at that time, nor the renunciation and the joining, nor the confession of faith. These took place step-by-step at various gatherings of catechumens and not just at once. Namely, they did not have, nor even have now, the character of a service, and for this reason they preserve their archaic form.

When this group of prebaptismal rites formed a type of service that preceded baptism and their original liturgical aim was forgotten as well as the time intervals that existed between them during the ancient period, a few unsuccessful attempts were made to set them into

594. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός . . ."
595. "Δέσποτα Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, προσκάλεσαι τὸν δοῦλόν σου . . ."
596. "εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι κατηχούμενον."

customary structures. Of the large number of manuscripts that contain the service of baptism, only a small number, and those written from the fourteenth until the sixteenth century, simply place in front only either "In the name of the Father . . ." (*Codex National Library of Athens 724*) or "Blessed is our God . . ."[597] and the trisagion (*National Library of Athens 696*) or only "Blessed is our God . . ."[598] and two or three troparia related to baptism, such as the apolytikion and the kontakion of Theophany (*National Library of Athens 669*) or "The memory of the just . . . ,"[599] "O Baptist of Christ...,"[600] and "By the intercession, O Lord, of all the saints . . ."[601] (*National Library of Athens 664*). Symeōn of Thessaloniki also attests to the same that "Blessed is our God . . ."[602] preceded and it appears that he also supports this ("and when the priest blesses, he must give thanks from the beginning and always to God for salvation of the lost"[603] and further down "after this, the hierarch blesses God seeing that it is meet for him to bless because of the finding of the one lost and the salvation of humankind,"[604] *Dialogue*, chapter 62), because perhaps there also existed those who disagreed with the correctness of this addition. Nevertheless, even in the manuscripts that we mentioned, this attempt remained incomplete because the "service" did not also conclude with a dismissal, as accordingly it should. Only one codex of the National Library, under number 851, of the sixteenth century also indicates, "and dismissal," without placing a blessing and so forth at the enarxis. The few printed Euchologia that note at the end "and dismissal" also follow such an incorrect tradition, without having taken care to also place a commensurate enarxis to the service in order that the dismissal is warranted.

Nevertheless, the addition of an enarxis and dismissal is not supported by the history or by the liturgical fabric of this group

597. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός . . ."
598. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός . . ."
599. "Μνήμη δικαίου . . ."
600. "Βαπτιστὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . ."
601. "Τῇ πρεσβείᾳ, Κύριε, πάντων τῶν ἁγίων . . ."
602. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός . . ."
603. PG 155:213c.
604. PG 155:217a.

of prayers, exorcisms, etc., and consequently its archaic and correct form was also well preserved in nearly all the manuscripts, the printed Euchologia, and liturgical practice to this day.

## 92

**For what reason is the gospel that the Typikon prescribes, namely, "After the Sabbath, at dawn . . . ,"[605] not read in the rite of the Resurrection, but instead the second eōthinon gospel, "When the Sabbath was past . . ."?[606]**

The gospel of the service of the Resurrection holds a curious and peculiar place in the all-night vigil of Pascha, which is not encountered in any other case nor in the services of the Byzantine liturgical Typikon in current use or in their manuscript tradition. Namely, it is read after the dismissal of the Midnight Office and before "Glory to the holy . . . ,"[607] that is to say, the enarxis of Matins, in other words, during a liturgically dead interval. And this, its position alone, shows that it is a later and intercalated element in the whole Paschal Service. This is attested to also by the manuscripts. Almost twenty Typika of those that Dmitrievskii[608] published at the end of the past century and at the beginning of the present one, and that cover nearly the entire period of the manuscript tradition from the eleventh up until also the nineteenth century, attest that the service of the Resurrection did not contain a gospel reading, but only the censing, "Glory to the holy . . . ,"[609] and the chanting of "Christ is risen."[610] And even nowadays, the service of the Resurrection as it is celebrated by the Slavs does not contain a gospel reading. Only three Hagioreitic Typika of those published by Dmitrievskii, and these much later, of the nineteenth century, provide for a reading of the gospel pericope in point: the Typikon of the monastery of

605. Matt 28:1–20.
606. Mark 16:1–8.
607. "Δόξα τῇ ἁγίᾳ . . ."
608. А. А. Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, хранящихся въ библиотекахъ Православного Востока, 3 vols. (Киев: Г. Т. Корчакъ-Новицкаго, 1895–1917).
609. "Δόξα τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ ὁμοουσίῳ . . ."
610. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη . . ."

Philotheou from 1813,[611] the Typikon of the monastery of Hagiou Pavlou from 1850,[612] and the Typikon of Vatopedi from 1869.[613] In addition, two older Typika, the one that is contained in the codex under number 1877 of the Vatican Library of the year 1292 and the other in the *Kanonarion* of the codex under number 150 of the monastery of the Sinai from the tenth–eleventh centuries, have a gospel reading, but while the former places it after the entrance into the temple and before the canon, namely in place of the gospel of Matins of Sundays and feasts, the latter places it at the end of Matins, like the customary service of the "asmatic" Sunday Matins, which was chanted in parish temples of that period. In contrast, the "asmatic" Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the tenth century (*Patmos 266* and *Timiou Staurou 40*) did not provide for the reading of an eōthinon gospel, not only at the end of the Matins of Pascha, but also for all the Sunday Matins during the period of the Pentēkostarion.

From all these things, this shows how much later, but also how little widespread was the practice that finally became prevalent in our Church during modern times, namely, for a gospel to be read during the service of the Resurrection. The instability regarding the choice of the pericope that ought to be read is also explained by this. As we saw, the older testimony that is contained in the *Sinaiticus Kanonarion* assigns the second eōthinon gospel ("When the Sabbath was past . . .")[614] as a gospel of the Matins of Pascha. The chronologically later evidence of the *Codex Vatican 1877* informs us that the first eōthinon gospel was read, namely, the end of the gospel of the Vespers of Pascha (. . . the eleven disciples travelled to Galilee . . . ),[615] a pericope, nevertheless, that is unrelated to the discovery of the occurrence of the Lord's Resurrection and to the Lord's appearance to the myrrhbearing women, as the other gospel, but to the first appearance of the Risen One to the disciples, according to the evangelist

611. Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 3:551.
612. Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 3:652.
613. Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 3:714.
614. Mark 16:1–8.
615. Matt 28:16–20.

Matthew. Of the three Hagioreitic Typika that we mentioned, and which contain the service of the Resurrection in its modern form, the Typikon of the monastery of Philotheou prescribes the gospel of Great Saturday, namely, "After the Sabbath . . . ,"[616] clearly in its entirety without any truncation, while the other two, of Hagiou Pavlou and Vatopedi, prescribe that this gospel is not read wholly, but up until the sentence "among the Jews to this day."[617] Nowadays, a dual practice prevails on the Holy Mountain. In some places, the second gospel is read and in others, "After the Sabbath . . . ,"[618] in its entirety or up until "Hail."[619] The Typikon of the Great Church also testifies to the same dual practice as being regularly in force. According to it, in the patriarchal temple, "After the Sabbath . . ."[620] in its entirety is read by the Patriarch, *[by others "to this day" (namely, verses 11–15), and the reading continued from "the eleven disciples . . ."*[621] *until the end].*[622] By others, however, the portion of the pericope, "While they were going...to this day" (namely, verses 11–15), was omitted and the reading continued from "the eleven disciples . . ." until the end.[623] In addition, the Typikon states that the second eōthinon gospel was read by some.[624] The reading of the second eōthinon gospel is also attested to by the printed Pentēkostarion and is preferred also by the *Calendar-Typikon of the Church of Greece.*[625]

Thus, we see clearly that there are two different traditions, of which the first, namely, the reading of the pericope, "After the Sab-

616. Matt 28:1–20; Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 3:551.

617. Matt 28:1–15; Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 3:652, 714.

618. Matt 28:1.

619. Matt 28:1–9.

620. Matt 28:1–20.

621. Matt 28:16.

622. This passage that here has been italicized and put into brackets appears to be a printing error in the Greek edition and should be disregarded. It appears to be part of the next sentence.

623. Matt 28:16–20.

624. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 368 (see also n. 2 on the same page).

625. *Ἡμερολόγιον-Τυπικὸν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος.* This is translated, *Calendar-Typikon of the Church of Greece.*

bath . . . ,"[626] is the relatively older and more widespread and the second, namely the reading of the second eōthinon gospel, is more modern but with a tendency to become prevalent. The cause likely was found in the fact that the gospel, "After the Sabbath . . . ,"[627] was previously read during Vespers and its repetition did not appear advisable. Besides, it is by far much longer than the second eōthinon gospel, which as shorter steadily gains ground. It appears that originally during the service of the Resurrection, the reading of the gospel of Great Saturday, "After the Sabbath . . . ,"[628] was introduced when the old service of the all-night vigil was divided into two parts and the Vespers with the Liturgy of Basileios the Great was chanted during the afternoon or even the morning of the Great Saturday, while the Midnight Office, Matins, and the Liturgy of Pascha were chanted during the night. Since neither the service of the Matins of Pascha, according to the old tradition that we saw, included the reading of the resurrectional eōthinon gospel, nor also during the Liturgy of Pascha was a resurrectional pericope read, but still according to an old custom the prologue of the Gospel according to John, it was viewed as useful and necessary before the enarxis of the service of the Resurrection that the reading of the pericope of Vespers be repeated, which described the occurrence of the Resurrection and which many had not heard, precisely because of the separation of the services.

Our priests can indifferently follow, as they also do already, one of the two traditions according to their judgment, or perhaps it would be preferable that they even follow both and that they read the pericopes alternately, one the one year and the other in the following, in order that the opportunity be given to the faithful to hear the joyful news of the Resurrection from two different evangelists.

626. Matt 28:1–20.
627. Matt 28:1–20.
628. Matt 28:1–20.

## 93

**During the Liturgy of the Presanctified, why do we read the same prayers twice, namely, the first, second, and third prayers of Lamp-lighting, a first time during the introductory psalm and a second time during the synaptes of the "To the Lord"?** [629]

In all the manuscripts and in all the old publications of the Liturgy of the Presanctified, these prayers occur only one time, either during the synaptes of the antiphons, as in the Divine Liturgy of Chrysostomos, where also their regular place is, or during the reading of the introductory psalm, in imitation of the corresponding practice in the service of Vespers. In this second instance, they were not repeated during the antiphons, but only the synaptes and exclamations were said. In all the manuscripts, these prayers were not the seven of Vespers, but only the first three or four, which correspond to the four exclamations, namely, the one of the litany of peace and the three after the three staseis of the kathisma of the Psalter. The texts of the Liturgy of the Presanctified usually have these prayers at the antiphons, while the "Diataxeis of the Liturgy of the Presanctified,"[630] which precede, prescribe that the prayers are said during the introductory psalm. A bad combination of these two different liturgical traditions brought about the present practice, which is attested to only by much more modern publications. In some others, in order to correct the apparent absurdity of repeating the first three prayers, it is prescribed that while the four last prayers ("from the fourth") are said during the introductory psalm, the first three are said during the synaptes of the antiphons. It is obvious that this solution is also a product of the conflict presented by the double reading of the prayers. The only appropriate way out would be that our liturgical books are corrected on the basis of the manuscripts and also the old publica-

629. The eighteenth kathisma (Psalms 119–133) is called the "To the Lord" ("τὰ Πρὸς Κύριον," or "τὰ προσκύρια," according to certain manuscripts) from the beginning phrase "To the Lord I cried when I was being afflicted . . ." ("Πρὸς Κύριον ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαί με ἐκέκραξα . . ." ) of Psalm 119.

630. This refers to the manuscript "Diataxeis" of the Presanctified that were discussed in question eighty-one.

tions, and that only the first three or four prayers are read during the litany of peace and the small synaptes, in the position that their exclamations prescribe, or if necessary, if a deacon does not also concelebrate, they are read during the introductory psalm, as takes place also in the ordinary Vespers. Their repetition is not consistent either with tradition or with logic.

## 94

**Can a funeral of a Catholic or Christian of another denomination be conducted by an Orthodox priest and which service is chanted?**

On this subject, there does not exist a consensus in the ancient liturgical and canonical practice of our Church. The burial of non-Orthodox by Orthodox clergy sometimes was permitted "by oikonomia" (κατ' οἰκονομίαν) and at other times again was forbidden "by strictness" (κατ' ἀκρίβειαν). We also have examples of instances where Orthodox and Latin clergy jointly chanted funeral services together, or of Orthodox who were interred in Latin cemeteries and vice versa. These things not only took place chiefly in areas occupied by the Latins, but also in other places, where a small number of Roman Catholics existed and lacked priests. We have such accounts as the answer of Iōannēs of Kitros,[631] according to which it was not considered "displeasing . . . nor an outrage to piety in any way whatever, the burial of Latins in Roman churches and the chanting together of Latin and Roman funeral rites by both

631. The canonical responses attributed to Iōannēs of Kitros are usually dated to the first half of the thirteenth century and little is known regarding the author. For a discussion and bibliography, see Spyros Troianos, "Byzantine Canon Law from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Centuries," in *The History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law to 1500*, ed. Wilfried Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington, vol. 4 of *History of Medieval Canon Law*, ed. Wilfried Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012), 202–203.

Roman and Latin priests";[632] the "Apologetic Declaration"[633] of Anthimos V, patriarch of Constantinople (1841–1842), according to which Uniates of the East were interred by Orthodox priests; the question of Kōnstantinos Kabasilas, archbishop of Dyrrachium (twelfth century), according to which "Latins who died . . . were

632. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 5:403–404. "Roman" here refers to the Orthodox and should not be confused with the modern designation "Roman Catholic." The following is a translation of the text:

Question.

Orthodox Romans are buried in Latin churches who are chanted for by both Romans and Latins at the same time, and Latins who are deceased likewise are chanted for by Romans and Latins together in common. Is this canonically penalized or not?

Answer.

There are two clear and great causes creating a separation between the Latins and us. The first and greater one is the dogma concerning the Holy Spirit. The second and not as important reason is the offering of the azymes. Scripture reading both of the Old and New Testament, prayers, chanting, divine temples, and veneration of the precious cross and holy icons are common to them and us. Therefore, burial of Latins in Roman churches and the chanting together of Latin and Roman funeral rites by both Roman and Latin priests is not displeasing nor an outrage to piety in any way whatever. For the place does not make the departed rejected before God and the chanting of the Latins over them is not pagan, but from our divine Scriptures. If someone perhaps believes that what occurs in this manner is outrageous, obviously he will discover this reasoning foolish. For those who had power during the time of impiety mixed the bodies of the saints with the carcasses of irrational animals and threw them into places full of filth, but the grace given to the saints consequently remained intact and the high Jerusalem, the metropolis of the firstborn, the land of the gentle, the beloved tabernacles are theirs. Tombs of impious emperors are also found in our holy churches, such as that of Julian the transgressor in the temple of the Holy and Wholly Blessed Apostles in Constantinople, indeed also the tombs of others holding false beliefs in other temples. Burial there is not beneficial for them. For their impiety remains, and theirs is the eternal fire of punishment. The burial of Christians entombed in Latin temples is then blameless, since even there is the proclamation and worship of the precious cross and of the divine images. At this point, a not unsuitable addition to this answer is the Gospel passage, "Leave the dead to bury their dead" [Luke 9:60], the text, I believe, showing their burial to be a means of corruption. Since henceforth it is not even necessary for those who live beyond this world, neither for the dead to be worthy of attentive care in preparation for burial, nor indeed to seek choice places for this.

633. "τὸ τακρίριον ἀπολογητικόν." The word "τακρίριον" is derived from the Turkish word, "takrir."

chanted by Romans and Latins together in common";[634] and the consistent practice of the churches of Crete and the Ionian Islands, where Roman Catholics and Anglicans are interred by Orthodox priests even in Orthodox cemeteries. In contrast, a 1701 decree[635] of Kallinikos II of Constantinople[636] forbids the burial of non-Orthodox by Orthodox priests, "because that one is anathema, how do priests wish to entreat God on his behalf so that God numbers him with the spirits of the righteous? ...therefore, it is impossible for Orthodox priests to inter dead heretics." Also, in the same way, Hieremias III of Constantinople[637] permits the interment of non-Orthodox by Orthodox priests only if the former "give up Latin belief, namely Latin conviction, and accept the faith and confession of our Eastern Church."

On October 20, 1869, Patriarch Grēgorios VI issued an encyclical concerning the interment of Anglicans, which under certain conditions permits their interment by Orthodox priests and prescribes the manner of celebration of the funeral service.[638] It is ex-

634. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 5:430–434.

635. "διάταξις."

636. Kallinikos II, patriarch of Constantinople (r. 1688, 1689–1693, 1694–1702).

637. Hieremias III, patriarch of Constantinople (r. 1716–1726, 1732–1733).

638. Grēgorios VI, patriarch of Constantinople (r. 1835–1840, 1867–1871). Μιχαὴλ Θεοτοκᾶς, *Νομολογία τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου* (Κωνσταντινούπολη: Νεολόγος, 1897), 363–364:

Since from the spiritual head of the Protestants in England the Most Eminent Archbishop of Canterbury lord Campbell [Archibald Campbell Tait (1811–1882)], a request recently came to us that when death might befall any of the Protestant Christians of the Anglican Church while visiting in our locales, his interment might take place in our Orthodox burial grounds, and because the Church received His Most Eminence's request in a fraternal manner, for this reason, writing by means of our present encyclical letter, we command and encourage also Your Holiness that in the event a Protestant Christian dies in any location of your eparchy where their own churchyards do not exist, it might be requested that the interment in our Orthodox ones takes place, Your Holiness might readily grant permission for interment in them without however providing right of ownership or allocation of the place of his grave. If a death might also take place of any other heterodox who do not have their own priests and the relatives of the deceased should request that our priests might attend to the deceased, Your Holiness might appoint one or two of our priests to attend to the deceased chanting the thrice-holy hymn, Psalm 117 [cited according to the

pressly stated that this pertains not only to Anglicans, but also to all the non-Orthodox. According to this encyclical, interment is permitted in Orthodox burial grounds,[639] especially where non-Orthodox ones do not exist, however, without in this manner providing a right of ownership over the grave.[640] In addition, Orthodox priests, where priests do not exist of the other denominations, to which the deceased belong, are permitted to accompany the deceased and to celebrate the funeral service. The taxis of the service was prescribed as follows: during the funeral procession, the trisagion hymn is chanted; and in the temple, the amōmos (Psalm 118) is chanted, the epistle and gospel are read, and an ektenēs and a usual small dismissal take place. At the grave, "The earth and its fullness are the Lord's . . ."[641] is said. However, where there are priests of their denominations, it is forbidden for our own to celebrate the service alone or in common with them. In accordance with this encyclical, both the other Patriarchates and the Church of Greece (Encyclical of the Sacred Synod, July 30, 1870)[642] permitted the interment of non-Orthodox by Orthodox priests and prescribed its standard rubric as above. It is verified that the Churches of Romania and Serbia during 1918 introduced a more liberal practice and celebrated the interment of non-Orthodox, at least, of Anglicans, "with a complete Orthodox service," exactly as it appears that this took place in the instances before the encyclical of 1869 that we mentioned.

Nowadays, the encyclical of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and of the Church of Greece applies to us, which we mentioned above,

---

Masoretic numbering] from the funeral service, with the reading of the Epistle and Gospel. Whenever there are priests of their own, our own do not take part in the service.

639. In Greece, public cemeteries are generally regarded as sacred grounds, often where a chapel is located, and interments in them are administered by the state and the Orthodox Church.

640. In Greece, it is common for exhumation to take place for the reuse of gravesites, although such plots can be leased or purchased. It is being inferred that purchase of the plot could not be done for non-Orthodox.

641. "Τοῦ Κυρίου ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς . . ."

642. Θεόκλητος Α. Στράγκας, *Ἐκκλησίας Ἑλλάδος ἱστορία ἐκ πηγῶν ἀψευδῶν: 1817–1967* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἐκδοτικὸν Τυπογραφεῖον Παπαδογιάννη, 1969), 1:355–356.

both as regards to the conditions and the manner of celebration of the funeral service.[643]

One can find more on this subject in the book of His Beatitude Archbishop Hierōnymos, *The Canonical Viewpoint Regarding Intercommunion with the Heterodox*, Athens, 1957, pp. 242 – 248.[644]

## 95

**Some of the priests are accustomed especially during festal Liturgies to cense the holy table, the icons, and the people after the small entrance of the Divine Liturgy during the time that the troparia are chanted. Is this correct?**

The offering of incense during the time of chanting troparia after the small entrance is an innovation and takes place improperly by those who do it, even if this aims at making the celebration of the Divine Liturgy in this way more festive.

Firstly, this censing is not provided for either by the manuscripts of the Liturgy, or by the printed editions, or by the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos of Constantinople, but also neither by the Byzantine commentators of the Divine Liturgy. Where in these sources there is a discussion regarding an offering of incense at this time, this pertains only to the hierarchical Liturgy. Indeed, even nowadays, the hierarch, after his entrance into the bēma, censes in the customary manner the altar, the icons, and the people. This irregular practice takes place in a bad imitation of the hierarchical Liturgy and fortunately by a small number of priests.

---

643. At the time of this translation, in the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, no formal direction has been given regarding the burial of those non-Orthodox spouses married to Orthodox, who are no longer in good standing with their denominations and have been refused burial by them as well. In such situations, non-Orthodox spouses have been married in the Orthodox Church but are not considered eligible for the celebration of any funeral rite. The modern cases in the question cited by Phountoulēs deal with instances where clergy of the non-Orthodox denomination are not physically available. The question could be raised whether there is an analogy to these instances when non-Orthodox clergy refuse to celebrate funeral rites for non-Orthodox spouses.

644. Ἱερώνυμος (Κοτσώνης), *Ἡ κανονικὴ ἄποψις περὶ τῆς ἐπικοινωνίας μετὰ τῶν ἑτεροδόξων (intercommunio)* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1957).

The correctness of the characterization, "irregular," will be shown not only from the lack of a relevant rubric, which we mentioned, but also from the history and the aim of this practice. Before the enarxis of the services of the mysteries, but also other services, such as Matins and Vespers, according to the most ancient practice that also applies in part up until now, incense was offered, and the altar, those present, and sometimes even the whole temple were censed by the celebrant. In the answer to question seventeen, we already wrote regarding the meaning of this incense according to the Sacred Scriptures. Both according to the manuscripts and according to the practice in force even still today, the priest censes before the enarxis of the services of baptism, marriage, unction, and so forth. This censing of the enarxis was not only preserved in the Divine Liturgy and is offered in the monasteries around the end of the services of the Sixth Hour or the Ninth Hour when Presanctified is celebrated, but also in parish temples during the chanting of the doxology, as we wrote then. And this takes place because the priest is starting to prepare himself and the temple for the celebration of this mystery. In the hierarchical Liturgy, something different takes place. The hierarch stands in the nave and attends the first part of the Liturgy from there, goes into the bēma for its celebration only during the small entrance, and at that time precisely offers the censing of the enarxis, because at that time essentially the celebration of the Liturgy begins by him. Namely, there is the same offering of incense in both instances, in the priestly, so to speak, Liturgy it is performed before its enarxis, in other words, before "Blessed is the Kingdom . . ."[645] and in the hierarchical one, again before its enarxis, that is to say, as soon as the hierarch entered the altar. In the most ancient times, the Liturgy was celebrated either by a priest or by a hierarch and began after the small entrance, a thing that was preserved in the present-day hierarchical Liturgy, and for this reason in ancient Liturgies, such as the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, during the small entrance, there is "the prayer of incense of the entrance."[646] Nowadays, the situation

645. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία . . ."

646. "ἡ εὐχὴ τοῦ θυμιάματος τῆς εἰσόδου." B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine,"

is different because liturgical development created an entire preliminary part for the Divine Liturgy that organically and inextricably is connected with it, and its celebration at least by the priest begins from "Blessed is the Kingdom . . . ."[647] Consequently, the censing of the enarxis has its position only before this exclamation.

To the possible objection that the censing during the apolytikia not only is not harmful, but even makes the Divine Liturgy more festive, we could respond that many other things also would not be harmful and would make the Divine Liturgy even more festive, but liturgical taxis is not determined by the level of intent for an action, but from liturgical tradition, which sets the standard and appropriateness in each instance and depends on the history of worship and on the meaning that every single one of the liturgical forms has, and not on arbitrary actions, which may even be done from good intentions. Besides, the Divine Liturgy even without this censing is sufficiently festive if it is done as it should be done, namely, with fear of God and with the wholehearted participation of the priest and people, with deep awareness of the meaning of the sacred-service and of the mystery that is concealed in every single feast.

## 96

**After the final dismissal of the mystery of marriage ("May Christ our true God, who by coming to Cana . . . Through the prayers")[648] must the first theotokion of Vespers of plagal of the first tone be chanted?[649] Notwithstanding that it is not recorded in the Euchologia, nevertheless it is customary to be said in some parishes.**

The service of marriage, as it has developed in the Byzantine liturgical Typikon, has the most beautiful prayers, but completely lacks its own hymnography. While other services of smaller importance, and less joyful, have been adorned with the richest and most beau-

---

*Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 48.

647. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία . . ."

648. "Ὁ διὰ τῆς ἐν Κανᾷ ἐπιδημίας τίμιον ἀναδείξας τὸν γάμον, Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . . Δι' εὐχῶν . . ."

649. "Ἐν τῇ Ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ . . ." "In the Red Sea . . ."

tiful hymns, such as the service of unction, the services of the hagiasmoi, the funeral services, monastic tonsure, and others, the service of marriage has very few troparia, and these are borrowed from other services and indeed not immediately related to the mystery being celebrated, such as the heirmos of the ninth ode of the plagal of the first tone, "Isaiah dance . . ."[650] and the two martyrika, "Holy martyrs . . ."[651] and "Glory to you, O Christ God . . . ."[652] Firstly, this is due to the fact that the secular Byzantine Typikon, to which this service remained faithful, did not have the wealth of troparia of the monastic Typikon, and, secondly, this is due to the fact that Byzantine poets were chiefly monks and the service of marriage did not interest them and did not particularly inspire them as a poetic subject. Only in a small number of manuscripts do we find a few special troparia, and these manuscripts are more recent and not even very trustworthy. In this way, in the codex under the number 665 from the sixteenth century of the National Library of Athens, there are four troparia probably of the plagal of the first tone (chanted to, "Isaiah dance . . ."?): "Receive the supplication of the priest . . . ,"[653] "O God who established marriage . . . ,"[654] "O God who received the prayers of Anna . . . ,"[655] and "O God who blessed marriage

650. "Ἠσαΐα χόρευε . . ."

651. "Ἅγιοι Μάρτυρες . . ."

652. "Δόξα σοι Χριστὲ ὁ Θεός . . ."

653. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens 665*, the full hymn reads, "Τοῦ ἱερέως δεχθῆναι τὴν ἱκεσίαν* κατὰ χρέος τὸ Θεῖον ἐκδυσωποῦμεν,* συνερχομένου τοῦ κλήρου τῆς Ἐκκλησίας· Υἱὲ Θεοῦ, εὐλόγησον τοὺς νυμφίους,* ἵνα πάντες χαρῶμεν* καὶ δοξάσωμεν τὸν Σωτῆρα Κύριον."

654. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens 665*, the full hymn reads, "Ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ τὸν γάμον* συστησάμενος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις* καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ὑποδείξας* τὴν τοῦ γάμου παιδοποιίαν,* αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν τοὺς νυμφίους* κέλευσον εὐλογηθῆναι τῇ χειρί σου,* ἵνα πάντες χαρῶμεν* καὶ δοξάσωμεν τὸν Σωτῆρα Κύριον."

655. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens 665*, the full hymn reads, "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, * (γράφε τῆς Ἄννης) προσεδεξάμενος τὰς δεήσεις, * καὶ χαρισάμενος αὐτῇ, * Σαμουὴλ εἰς παραμυθίαν* αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν τῇ χειρί σου, * κέλευσον εὐλογηθῆναι τὸν γάμον τοῦτον* ἵνα πάντες [πάντες χαρῶμεν* καὶ δοξάσωμεν τὸν Σωτῆρα] Κύριον. The inserted text for this hymn (and the ones that follow) was made on the basis of the first hymn and does not appear in Trempelas.

in Cana of Galilee . . . ."[656] Likewise, in the manuscript under number 668 from the seventeenth century of the same library, there are six small troparia of the second tone chanted to, "House of Ephrathah . . . ,"[657] with an alphabetical acrostic (Alpha–Zēta), which were chanted with verses from the 127th Psalm ("Blessed are all who fear the Lord . . . ),[658] which begin with the phrases: "Holy Father . . . ,"[659] "Look now upon the people . . . ,"[660] "The marriage now here . . . ",[661] "Receive, O Baptist . . . ,"[662] "Through the prayers of the sacred . . . ,"[663] and "Peaceful life. . . ."[664] One can find both of these series of troparia published in the *Small Euchologion* of Professor P. Trempelas, volume 1, pp. 94–95.[665] Likewise, in two manuscripts (*Cairo 149* of the fourteenth century and *Sinai 977* of the year 1516) there is an idiomelon of the plagal of the first tone, "In Cana of

656. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens* 665, the full hymn reads, "Ὁ ἐν Κανᾷ Γαλιλαίας* εὐλογήσας Θεὸς τὸν γάμον* καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς οἶνον* τῇ δυνάμει σου ἁγιάσας,* αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν οἰκείᾳ παλάμῃ* κέλευσον εὐλογηθῆναι τὸν γάμον τοῦτον,* ἵνα πάντες [χαρῶμεν* καὶ δοξάσωμεν τὸν Σωτῆρα Κύριον]."

657. "Οἶκος τοῦ Εὐραθᾶ . . ."

658. "Μακάριοι πάντες οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν Κύριον . . ."

659. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens* 665, the full hymn reads, "Ἅγιος ὁ Πατήρ,* ἅγιος εἶ ὁ Λόγος,* ἅγιον καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα,* Τριὰς ἡ Παναγία,* τὸν γάμον νῦν εὐλόγησον."

660. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens* 665, the full hymn reads, "Βλέψον νῦν εἰς λαόν* βοῶντα Θεοτόκε,* καὶ δέξαι τὰς δεήσεις* εὐλόγησον τὸν γάμον* τὸν τῇδε ὦ Πανύμνητε."

661. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens* 665, the full hymn reads, "Γάμον τὸν τῇδε νῦν,* Ἀρχάγγελοι Κυρίου,* Μιχαὴλ Γαβριήλ τε,* ἐξ ὕψους ἐποφθέντες* αὐτὸν περιφρουρήσατε."

662. Referenced by Phountoulēs as published by Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens* 665, the full hymn reads, "Δέξαι, ὦ Βαπτιστά* καὶ Πρόδρομε Κυρίου,* λιτὰς τῶν ἱερέων* καὶ γάμον νῦν τὸν τῇδε* εὐλόγησον, πανάγιε."

663. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:95, from *National Library of Athens* 665, the full hymn reads, "Εὐχαῖς τῶν ἱερῶν* καὶ θείων Ἀποστόλων,* Υἱὲ Θεοῦ καὶ Λόγε,* ὡς ἐν Κανᾷ τὸν γάμον* καὶ τοῦτον νῦν εὐλόγησον."

664. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:95, from *National Library of Athens* 665, the full hymn reads, "Ζωὴν εἰρηνικήν* καὶ μακρόβιον γῆρας* τοῖς δούλοις σου παράσχου,* τοῖς ἄρτι νεονύμφοις,* πανάγιε Νικόλαε."

665. Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 2 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1950–1955).

Gallilee, a marriage took place when the Lord was present . . . ,"[666] which does not refer directly to the celebration of marriage, but to a related theme, namely, to the wedding in Cana, as also the pericope from the gospel does. This has been published by Ambrosios Stavrinos, former Metropolitan of Caesarea, in his work, *The Benediction of Marriage*, p. 144.[667] It would be wonderful in a revision of our Euchologia to also include these troparia somewhat corrected, in order to make up for the lack of hymns in the service of marriage, which is so apparent.

However, since these troparia remained in obscurity, because as we saw they are attested to by a small number of manuscripts and for this reason were not included in printed editions, and since there were no others more suitable, and finally, since Christians were used to troparia and common sentiment expected the chanting of them, hymns the least irrelevant to marriage were pressed into service. The theotokia were considered as such. The Theotokos, "the unwed bride," was the protectress of the family home and the theotokia speak about her conception transcending nature and the Lord's birth, concepts that linked these troparia to the mystery of marriage. The troparion that is attested to most by the manuscripts is, "All of creation rejoices in you, O full of grace . . ."[668] (*Cairo 1070, Lavras 105, Metochiou Hag. Taphou 8, Panteleēmonos 780, Pantokratoros 149, Patmos 104, 690,* and *715, Sinai 968*); others record, "The most pure

666. Σταυρινός, *Ἡ Ἱερολογία*, 144, from *Cairo 149* and *Sinai 977*, the full hymn reads, " Ἐν Κανᾷ τῆς Γαλιλαίας* γάμος ἐγένετο παρόντος τοῦ Κυρίου.* Ἔφη ἡ ἄμεμπτος πρὸς τὸν Σωτῆρα·* Οἶνον οὐκ ἔχουσι.* Στραφεῖσα δὲ λέγει τοῖς διακόνοις·* Γεμίσατε τὰς ὑδρίας ὕδατος.* Ὁ δὲ φιλόστοργος καὶ παντοδύναμος Θεός ηὐλόγησε* καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον ἐποίησεν.* Ὦ παραδόξου θαύματος!* Ὦ φρικτοῦ μυστηρίου!* Τίς δύναται ταῦτα ποιεῖν,* εἰ μὴ μόνος Κύριος καὶ Θεὸς Ἰσραήλ,* ὁ ὑπὸ τῶν Χερουβὶμ ἀνυμνούμενος* καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Σεραφὶμ δοξαζόμενος* καὶ ὑπὸ πάσης κτίσεως δορυφορούμενος.* Μέγα σου τὸ ἔλεος* καὶ μεγάλη ἡ ἰσχύς σου, Φιλάνθρωπε,* καὶ μεγάλη ἡ δύναμίς σου·* δόξα σοι."

667. Ἀμβρόσιος Σταυρινός, *Ἡ Ἱερολογία τοῦ γάμου ἀπὸ τὰ τέλη τοῦ Θ΄ μέχρι τοῦ τέλους τοῦ ΙΣΤ΄ αἰώνος*, (Κωνσταντινούπολη: ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1923). Ambrosios Stavrinos (1854–1931) after serving in several sees as a hierarch, including Neocaesarea, ended his career as Metropolitan of Derkoi (r. 1929–1931).

668. "Ἐπὶ σοὶ χαίρει, κεχαριτωμένη . . ."

temple of the Savior . . ."[669] (*Lavras 21*) or "Your birth sanctified a virgin's womb . . ."[670] (*National Library of Athens 64*) or "After you were born . . ."[671] (*Lavras 21*) or "The glory of all the world . . ."[672] (*Patmos 689*), and two together or even three from the ones above. The chanting of the first theotokia of Damaskēnos[673] of the eight tones is attested to by other manuscripts as occurring during the transition from the temple "to the bridal chamber" (*Cairo 1070, Lavras 21*). The prevalent practice nowadays, namely, the chanting of the theotokion of Saturday Vespers of the plagal of the first tone, "In the Red Sea . . . ,"[674] is associated with the last tradition that we mentioned, and constitutes in some manner an epitome of this. The chanting was confined to the temple in order for the time of the kiss[675] to be covered, and to "In the Red Sea . . . ," because this was considered perhaps the most festive and, therefore, the most becoming for the service of Marriage.

## 97

**Is there any canonical legislation that prescribes when the exhumation of the dead should take place?**

There does not exist relevant legislation regarding exhumation of the dead. Earlier, just as also nowadays still in many places, exhumation did not take place, but the dead remained in their graves forever, save only if special reasons necessitated the removal of the remains, such as for example, if someone was recognized as a saint, if the transference of the deceased's bones to his fatherland took place, or if a member of the same family was laid in the same grave. And even nowadays, archaeological excavations bring to light Christian

669. "Ὁ καθαρώτατος ναὸς τοῦ Σωτῆρος . . ."
670. "Ὁ μήτραν παρθενικήν . . ."
671. "Μετὰ τὸ τεχθῆναί σε . . ."
672. "Τὴν παγκόσμιον δόξαν . . ."
673. Saint Iōannēs of Damascus (ca. 650 or ca. 675–749 or 753/4). For an excellent study, see Andrew Louth, *St. John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
674. "Ἐν τῇ Ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ . . ."
675. On the kissing of the crowns and the newlyweds, see question 25.

graves that were never opened, though centuries have passed from the time of the interment of the dead that were laid in them. It appears that certain canons, which penalize grave robbing (see especially canon seven of Grēgorios of Nyssa), precisely imply that at that time custom did not permit the bones of the dead to be removed from their graves.[676] However, we also have rare instances when, apart from the exceptions that we noted above, exhumation and gathering together of the bones of many dead into ossuaries took place, as confirmed again by archaeological investigation.

Indeed, there would not exist a more beautiful thing than for someone to rest in his grave "until the general resurrection," by beautiful symbolism looking towards the east and awaiting the sound of the last trumpet.[677] As a result, we also would not have the not-so-beautiful sight of heaps of bones in the burial places/cemeteries or their hoarding in the macabre boxes of ossuaries. But exhumation was necessitated in many places, especially in cities, for reasons purely of practical need. Amid the overcrowding of graveyards, the dead ought to yield their graves to the incoming because otherwise the cities of the dead would become greater than the cities of the living.

When now would the exhumation take place? Certainly, the time required for the full decomposition of the body ought to pass. This depends on the idiosyncrasies of the dead, the age, the causes of the death; on the type of grave; on the composition of the ground; on the climatic conditions; and on the method of burial. In general, according to medical data, two years are sufficient as a general rule for the full decomposition of bodies.[678] But since the view prevailed in the past, as it also does up until now, that the body's incomplete decomposition "into its constituent parts" is a result of the gravest sins or of excommunication and generally was viewed as something

676. For an overview of such legislation, see Patrick Viscuso, "Death in Late Byzantine Canon Law," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 51 (2002): 225–248.

677. 1 Cor 15:52.

678. On the Holy Mountain, exhumations are done after three years. Coffins are not used on Mount Athos. In Greece, in those instances where coffins are used, this has led to lengthening the time necessary for the decomposition of bodies.

terrible and sinister, it was judged good for the interment to be extended as long as possible for reasons of security, so that the decomposition of the body would be presumably ensured. Regarding this subject, there is a related question, and we will have the opportunity to discuss it in detail. However, since again the sacred number of the Holy Trinity, three, played a particular role in the regulation of not just the particulars of the faithful's life, but even death, the custom became prevalent that the exhumation take place either at the beginning or mainly after the completion of three years from death. Furthermore, even the Lord remained three days in the tomb. Nevertheless, these symbolisms did not prevent various local churches from determining, in accordance with the local customs prevailing in each locale, the exhumation or the non-exhumation of bodies and, in the first instance, the time of the exhumation, or even the parallel preservation of both relevant customs, depending on the circumstances.

We conclude that local customs apply especially with regard to the time for exhumation of the dead, which for the most part assume three-year burial. In any case, as a minimum time limit, two years must be observed, or at least the time which local experience taught that suffices for the full decomposition of the body.[679]

## 98

**In the service of betrothal and before "Blessed is our God . . ."[680] must the kontakion of Saint Kōnstantinos be chanted?**

## 99

**In the service of the mystery of marriage and before "Blessed is the Kingdom . . ."[681] must the apolytikion of Saint Kōnstantinos be chanted?**

---

679. Since this writing, the more widespread use of chemotherapy has extended the time necessary for decomposition of bodies, in some cases up to nine years. For additional information regarding beliefs associated with exhumation, see question 59 and Loring M. Danforth, *The Death Rituals of Rural Greece* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982).

680. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός . . ."

681. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία . . ."

The chanting of the kontakion of Saint Kōnstantinos before the enarxis of the service of betrothal, just as also the chanting of the apolytikion of the same saint before the enarxis of the service of crowning has become prevalent nowadays in many places. This is not unrelated to the mention of the holy "sovereigns crowned by God and equal to the Apostles, Kōnstantinos and Helenē," during the dismissal and to the reference to "that joy, which Blessed Helenē had when she found the precious cross," which is mentioned in the second prayer of the crowning.[682] And in the case of the dismissal and the prayer, and in the chanting of the troparia, one might justifiably ask oneself what is the relationship of these two sacred persons to marriage and its service. Admittedly, the association that occurred is so curious and excessive, that one would not wish the dissemination of this practice, however great would be one's devotion toward the first Christian rulers.

Why is it that these troparia were introduced into the service of betrothal and marriage? The first reason appears to be related to the introduction of theotokia, concerning which we spoke in the response to question ninety-six. The service of marriage did not have its own troparia. Nevertheless, custom required chanting of a troparion. As such, in some manuscripts, "the troparion of the day" (*National Library of Athens 663* and *S. 64*) or "the apolytikion and kontakion of the day" (*National Library of Athens 849, Cairo 1070, Metochiou Hag. Taphou 8, Panteleēmonos 364, 780, Pantokratoros 149,* and *Sinai 698*) are introduced. But the troparia of the day were unable to relate to the service of marriage, for this reason in some manuscripts one encounters, together with the latter, both the apolytikion and kontakion of Saint Kōnstantinos (*National Library of Athens S. 64, Metochiou Hag. Taphou 8* and *615, Pantokratoros 149,* and *Sinai 996*) or even only the troparia of Saint Kōnstantinos (*National Library of Athens 829*), as is done in many places today. Why now was the troparion of Saint Kōnstantinos considered more relevant? First, Saints Kōnstantinos and Helenē are characterized as "crowned by God" and this characterization recalled the coro-

682. The prayer begins, "Εὐλογητος εἶ Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τοῦ μυστικοῦ . . ."

nation by God of the newlyweds, like also the crowns sent down from heaven on the Holy Forty martyrs recalled the same thing, and for this reason mention is also made of them in the second prayer of marriage. Second, according to prevailing opinion, the Byzantine service of marriage was originally composed for the crowning of emperors, and for this reason also in many codices the entire service bears the title, "taxis that takes place for the betrothals of an emperor and other people" (*National Library of Athens 662* and *1910*, and *Paris Coislin 213*), and in many others, the chanting of imperial hymns is provided for, such as the Twentieth Psalm ("O Lord, in your power the king shall be glad . . .") and the Eighth Psalm ("O Lord, our Lord, how admirable is your name in all the earth..."). The form wedding crowns assumed for the Byzantines is precisely due to the influence of imperial weddings, according to the testimony of Theodōros the Stoudite, and for the Slavs, where they have the form of real imperial crowns, as well as the girding of the bridegroom with a sword, which many manuscripts attest to, and which took place up until recent years in Pontus. But regardless of its historical origin, the service of marriage has a strong royal hue. The new couple, with their entrance into marriage, receives dominion over creation and the world, which is connected with the increasing of the race according to the word of God, "increase and multiply and fill the earth and have dominion over it and rule . . ." (Gen 1:28). What then more naturally does both the theoretical and historical foundation of the service of marriage bring to mind, and consequently also to the chanting of troparia, than the first Christian "sovereigns crowned by God and equal to the apostles," Saint Kōnstantinos and Saint Helenē?

## 100

**Why in the last petitions of Compline and the Midnight Office does the priest say, "Ὑπερ τῶν ἐν θαλάσσῃ καλῶς πλεόντων" (For those who sail well on the sea)? What does "καλῶς" (well) mean?**

This phrase constitutes a petition on behalf of those Christians who travel on the sea and is parallel to the phrase "τοὺς ἐν θαλάσσῃ κυβέρνησον" (guide them on the sea) of the personal prayer summarizing these petitions, "Τοῖς μισοῦσι καὶ ἀδικοῦσιν ἡμᾶς συγχώρησον, Κύριε . . ." (O Lord, pardon those who hate and wrong us . . .), which is said, "in the cells," after the dismissal of Compline. The "καλῶς" (well) is a specification of the manner and aim of "πλεόντων" (those who sail) and is absent from some manuscripts, because it appears that not even then was the exact meaning of this adverb understandable to many. I have heard also nowadays some priest omitting it and indeed even one replacing it with "κακῶς" (badly), with the explanation that those who sail "well," namely, those who have a good trip, do not have as much need of the Church's entreaties as those who sail "badly," namely those who are in danger on the trip, because this is how he understood the meaning of the adverbs. However, this phrase has another meaning; it means those who travel for good aims and not pirates, who during the period that these petitions were written, especially constituted a scourge of the islands and coastal cities and towns.

There also exist manuscripts (such as *Panteleēmonos 72* and *Xēropotamou 210*), which do not have the adverb "καλῶς" (well) in the petition in question but add the parallel specification: "χριστιανῶν" (Christians), "Ὑπερ τῶν ἐν θαλάσσῃ πλεόντων χριστιανῶν" (For Christians who sail on the sea).

Incidentally, let us also note the beautiful response of the people to this priestly exhortation, which, instead of the more prevalent, "Κύριε ἐλέησον" (Lord have mercy), in quite a few old manuscripts is: "Ὁ Θεὸς κυβερνήσει (or κυβερνήσαι) αὐτούς" (God will guide [or May God guide] them" (*Athens 688, 2247, Vatopediou 1250, Kōnstamonitou 26, Lavras Θ 19, Xēropotamou 210,*

*Panteleēmonos 360*) or "Ὁ Θεὸς κατευοδεῖ αὐτούς" (God guides them aright) (*Athens 660*).[683]

## 101

**At the time of the Cherubic hymn must the priest say, "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ."[684] or only the Fiftieth Psalm?**

This point of the Divine Liturgy presents many variations in the manuscripts and in the printed editions, even in present-day practice. It appears that in the past the prayer of the Cherubic hymn, "No one is worthy . . . ,"[685] was not even said. However, it was introduced early as a preparatory prayer of the celebrant for the performance of the mystery, though later, the Fiftieth Psalm or other psalms (Twenty-Third, Twenty-Fifth), the recitation of the Cherubic hymn, as well as various penitential troparia and prayers were added for the same purpose. The manuscripts display a great lack of uniformity here.

Notably, "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ." is not attested to by ancient manuscripts, nor by the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos of Constantinople, or even by many printed editions, but is encountered in later codices, always however accompanied with a note that it is said only, "if it is a Sunday." Analogously, we can conclude that it was also said during Liturgies of the Paschal period, inasmuch as also these have a resurrectional character. The addition of "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ." obviously aimed at lessening in some way the penitential character of this part of the service on Sundays and highlighting their Paschal character. During the remaining days, consistent with the spirit which this addition expresses, but also consistent with the

683. The captain of a ship is sometimes referred to as the "κυβερνήτης," the one who pilots or governs the craft. The petition may be alluding to a naval theme in portraying God as the one who guides, navigates, or pilots.

684. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι . . ."

685. "Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος . . ."

letter of the standard rubrics that we mentioned, it is not proper to be said, but is replaced by the triple, "O come, let us worship . . . ."[686]

## 102

**Why when the priest fills the holy chalice with the Holy Bread does he say the resurrectional troparia, "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . . ,"[687] "Shine, shine . . . ,"[688] "O divine, O beloved . . . ,"[689] and "O great Pascha . . ."?[690] Must they be said even on a day of commemoration when a saint is celebrated?**

"Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ." and the three other resurrectional troparia, which are said after the communion of the priest at the time of the collection[691] of the lamb and the remaining particles (μερίδων) into the holy chalice, constitute a later element and was inserted into the Divine Liturgy. They are not attested to either by manuscripts or by the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos, or even contained in many printed editions. They exist only in a few modern editions and are said nowadays by nearly all priests.

---

686. "Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν."
687. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι."
688. "Φωτίζου, φωτίζου . . ."
689. "Ὦ θείας, ὦ φίλης . . ."
690. "Ὢ Πάσχα τὸ μέγα . . ."
691. "συστολή." The related verb "συστέλλω" can be translated "to consume," such as in the case of "εὐχὴ ἐν τῷ συστεῖλαι τὰ ἅγια ἐν τῷ σκευοφυλακίῳ" (prayer while consuming the Holy Elements in the skeuophylakon). In this case, the word is used similarly to the English expression "he consumes the chalice," meaning, that he consumes the contents of the chalice. In this sense, the word "συστέλλει," can also be translated "he cleanses." However, in the present question, the action, "τῆς συστολῆς τοῦ ἀμνοῦ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν μερίδων στὸ ἅγιο ποτήριο," is described in the next paragraph as "the transference of the particles of the lamb and the remaining contents of the paten into the holy chalice did not take place before the communion of the faithful" (ἡ μεταφορὰ τῶν μερίδων τοῦ ἀμνοῦ καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ περιεχομένου τοῦ δισκαρίου στὸ ἅγιο ποτήριο δὲν ἐγίνετο πρὸ τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν πιστῶν). Consequently, the word is translated in the present question in the sense of a "transference," but with a differing term, "collection," to also imply the bringing together of the particles as well as cleansing of the paten with the mousa and to distinguish the differing Greek terms. See the discussion of the verb "εἰσκοσμεῖν" below, which is also used to describe this action.

In order that we understand the reasons that led to the addition of these troparia at this point of the Divine Liturgy as well as their meaning, we must refer back to the history and to the symbolism of what is being celebrated at this moment. Initially, immediately after the communion of the priests, the communion of the faithful followed without breaking off the chanting of the koinōnikon or saying, "With fear of God . . . ." Since we know that holy communion was given to the people in the same manner that priests, or rather deacons, commune nowadays, namely, that the holy Body was given by the priest into their right palm and, after they consumed it, the chalice was offered to them and they would drink directly from it, it is self-evident that the transference of the particles of the lamb and the remaining contents of the paten into the holy chalice did not take place before the communion of the faithful.[692] However, when during later times, the manner of communing the sick, namely, by the labis, was extended to all the faithful, the particles of the lamb had to be placed into the holy chalice before the communion of the faithful. When the ranks and particles of the living and the dead were introduced, namely, when in subsequent times, the prothesis took on its contemporary form, and when the faithful's approach to holy communion was considerably restricted, it became prevalent for the entire contents of the holy paten to be emptied into the chalice immediately after the communion of the priests and before the communion of the faithful. However, the transference of the particles and the sponging[693] of the paten required a certain interval of time.

---

692. See question 518 where Phountoulēs emphasizes with the quotation of Symeōn of Thessaloniki that the communion of the faithful must only take place from the Lamb and not other particles.

693. "ὁ ἀποσπογγισμός." In this case, the wiping action with the mousa, a sponge used for cleansing the antiminsion and holy vessels, is being described. The word parallels the term "ἐμάξας" (a wiping action for depositing the remaining Holy Elements into the chalice) which is used to describe this action in the *Diataxis* of Philotheos, Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 14. Another word used to describe this act is the verb "εἰσκομίζειν." Compare the use of this word in the fourteenth century *Vatopediou 135*, "λαβὼν μετὰ χεῖρας τόν τε ἅγιον δίσκον καὶ τὴν μοῦσαν, εἰσκομίζει πάντα ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ποτηρίῳ μετὰ φόβου καὶ πάσης ἀσφαλείας, ὥστε μηδέν τι τῶν λεπτοτάτων ἐκπεσεῖν ἢ καταλειφθῆναι" (taking with his hand both the holy paten and mousa, he introduces every-

Nevertheless, we also know from other parallel examples that the piety of our priests did not permit them, even during these empty intervals, to close their mouths and not ceaselessly murmur hymns of glorification to God. Thus, also at this point, the introduction began of verses from psalms such as "You have thoroughly anointed my head with oil . . . ,"[694] of short prayers of thanksgiving, and relevant known troparia, which initially were said according to tradition or according to the individual intent and piety of the priest, and gradually did not fail to be recorded in subsequent manuscripts. Of these troparia, "You have smitten me with yearning, O Christ . . ."[695] is the one most attested to, which also gives us the key to understand the selection of, at least, one of the resurrectional troparia. That troparion speaks concerning the attraction of divine longing and the change by divine love and is entreating for the burning up of sins and for humanity to be filled with delight in Christ. In the last of the resurrectional troparia ("O great Pascha . . ."), there is the entreaty that the faithful "more profoundly"[696] partake of Christ, who is the "great and most sacred Pascha"[697] on the unending day of his kingdom. The verses of the psalms and the short prayers that one encounters in later manuscripts, which we have mentioned, refer to the same themes of thanksgiving. After holy communion, it was natural for the priest to feel that indescribable joy of Christ's presence filling his heart, but at the same time of the desire born for total and unending union with Christ on the day of His kingdom. The two preceding troparia, "Shine, shine . . ." and "O divine, O beloved . . . ," belong to the same framework, but it seems that they came in later,

---

thing into the holy chalice with fear and every care, so that none of the finest parts fall or are remaining), *Διάταξις τῆς Θείας Λειτουργίας κατὰ τὰ Βατοπαιδινὰ Χειρόγραφα τοῦ ΙΔ' αἰῶνα* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἱερὰ Μεγίστη Μονὴ Βατοπαιδίου, 2019), 1:133. Phountoulēs himself uses the word identically in the phrasing of question 591 where it describes the action of introducing or transferring the particles of the paten into the chalice (here, also described with words, "ἡ μεταφορὰ τῶν μερίδων . . . στὸ ἅγιο ποτήριο). The word "introduces" instead of "transfers" is used to differentiate the translation of the various Greek terms.

694. Ps 22:5.

695. "Ἐθέλξας πόθῳ με, Χριστέ . . ."

696. "ἐκτυπώτερον."

697. "Ὦ Πάσχα τὸ μέγα καὶ ἱερώτατον."

being drawn in by the last troparion, because altogether, as we know, they constitute the ninth ode of the canon of Pascha. Many such analogous examples exist in our services. For the sake of one relevant troparion or one verse by an acquired habit, an entire series of troparia or the entire psalm, in which this verse is found, is included.

With regard to the resurrectional character of "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ." and the remaining troparia, it could be argued that initially they were only said on Sundays and during the Paschal period, as took place with "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ." during the chanting of the Cherubic hymn, and afterwards, again by acquired habit, their use was extended also to other days. Although this hypothesis would not be implausible, it appears that it is more correct that they are associated with the Paschal character and the resurrectional symbolism of holy communion. According to the words of the apostle Paul, "for Christ our paschal lamb was sacrificed for us" (1 Cor 5:7). With his/her participation in this paschal sacrifice of the lamb of God, of the suffering and resurrected Lord, according to the characteristic words of the sacred Chrysostomos, the believer, "as often as he might commune with a pure conscience, celebrates Pascha . . . when he partakes of the sacrifice . . . he celebrates Pascha whether today, tomorrow, or at any time whenever he partakes of communion,"[698] and "The mystery at Pascha is not greater than that which is now celebrated. The same grace of the Spirit is one and the same. It is always Pascha... And on Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and on days of martyrs, the same

698. Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos, *Homily 3 Against the Jews* 4, 5 (PG 48:868). Phountoulēs does not identify the source of these quotes, which are adapted. Phountoulēs quotes the following, "ὁσάκις ἄν κοινωνῇ μετὰ καθαροῦ συνειδότος Πάσχα ἐπιτελεῖ . . . ὅταν τῆς θυσίας μετέχῃ . . . Πάσχα ἐπιτελεῖ κἂν σήμερον, κἂν αὔριον, κἂν ὁποτεοῦν μετάσχῃ τῆς κοινωνίας," while the text in PG reads as follows (the underlining indicates portions taken by Phountoulēs), "Ὥστε ὁσάκις ἂν προσίῃς μετὰ καθαροῦ συνειδότος, πάσχα ἐπιτελεῖς, οὐχ ὅταν νηστεύῃς, ἀλλ' ὅταν τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης μετέχῃς . . . ε'. Ὁ γοῦν κατηχούμενος οὐδέποτε πάσχα ἐπιτελεῖ, καίτοι νηστεύων κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, ἐπειδὴ προσφορᾶς οὐ κοινωνεῖ, ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ ὁ μὴ νηστεύων, ἂν μετὰ καθαροῦ προσέλθῃ συνειδότος, πάσχα ἐπιτελεῖ, κἂν σήμερον, κἂν αὔριον, κἂν ὁποτεοῦν μετάσχῃ τῆς κοινωνίας." Phountoulēs substitutes "κοινωνῇ" for "προσίῃς." He also modifies several other verbs.

sacrifice is performed . . . no boundary of time limited the sacrifice"[699] (*Homily 5 on 1 Timothy*).

Therefore, within this Paschal atmosphere of the Divine Liturgy, whichever day of the week it is celebrated, these resurrectional troparia fit in well, even if, as an element inserted later, they are not an inseparable part of our Liturgy.

## 103

**When the Symbol of Faith is recited by the choir, must the celebrant also say it inaudibly (μυστικῶς)?**

According to all the manuscripts of the Divine Liturgy, the Symbol of Faith was said by the people, while the priest shook the aër over the gifts. Together with the people, it appears that the priest also recited the Symbol simultaneously. At least, certain later manuscripts so attest, explicitly noting that the priest says, "also himself the Holy Symbol until the end," and the present practice preserved this.

However, at this point, the taxis of the Divine Liturgy, as it presents itself today, has suffered a serious corruption that is owed to the reading inaudibly of the introduction of the prayer of the anaphora, namely, "It is proper and right to hymn you . . ."[700] of the Liturgy of the sacred Chrysostomos and "O Master, He who is, Lord God . . ."[701] of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great. Since it became prevalent for the prayer to be said inaudibly and since the time, during which "It is proper and right"[702] is chanted, is insufficient to cover its reading, while the choir recites the Symbol slowly, the priest says it hastily in order to give him time to read the greater part of the relevant prayer (customarily up until "that have been bestowed on us"[703] of the Liturgy of Chrysostomos and "for all things are subject to you"[704] of the Liturgy of Basileios) during the space of

699. Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos, *Homily 5 on 1 Timothy* 3 (PG 62:529–530). This quotation is precise.

700. "Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον σὲ ὑμνεῖν . . ."

701. "Ὁ ὢν Δέσποτα, Κύριε Θεέ . . ."

702. This is the liturgical response that has the same beginning words, and not the introduction of the prayer.

703. "τῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς γεγενημένων."

704. "ὅτι τὰ σύμπαντα δοῦλα σά."

time that remains. But, in this way also, the Symbol's hasty recitation by the priest is improper, the unity between the priest and the people is split, the first part of the prayer of the anaphora is said in an inappropriate location, and the continuity of the entire prayer is destroyed. It is self-evident that all this creates true confusion and an unacceptable disturbance for the harmonious celebration of the mystery. Normally, clergy and laity must altogether "with one voice"[705] confess their faith jointly by reciting the Holy Symbol and, after "It is proper and right," for the recitation of the prayer of the anaphora to begin, namely, in its correct location. This was precisely what took place also in the ancient church and nowadays quite a few priests are inclined to return to this correct practice.

## 104

**Before the consecration of the precious gifts ("and make . . ."[706]) quite a few priests make three prostrations, others do not. Which is more correct?**

The triple prostration before the consecration of the precious gifts is attested to not only by many later manuscripts ("and both—the priest and the deacon—make a prostration three times before the holy table," *National Library of Athens 752, 765, 766, 767, 770, 773,* and *776* of the sixteenth–eighteenth centuries) and by all the printed editions of the Liturgies, but also by other more ancient codices, such as the scroll[707] of the Byzantine Museum of Athens under number 6 of the twelfth century ("and he makes a prostration three times") and by the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos of Constantinople ( "they both make a prostration three times before the holy table while praying to themselves," *Codex Panteleëmonos 6277–770* of the fourteenth century).[708] The content of

705. "ἐν ἑνὶ στόματι."

706. "καὶ ποίησον."

707. "τὸ εἰλητάριο." According to the art historian Antonia Arahova, "Although scrolls were largely replaced by codices as early as the fourth century, they continued to be used for church practice, especially for copying the Divine Liturgy," Anastasia Drandaki, et al, eds., *Heaven & Earth: Art of Byzantium from Greek Collections* (Athens: National Gallery of Art, 2013), 1:148.

708. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 11.

the prayer "to themselves" of the celebrants, which accompanied the triple prostration, is prescribed by the same or many other later manuscripts or printed liturgical books as, "O God, have mercy on me the sinner,"[709] or as the troparion, "O Lord, who did send down your All-holy Spirit . . . ,"[710] three times with the two verses, "A pure heart..."[711] and "Cast me not away from your presence . . . ,"[712] or more rarely as, "When the Most High came down . . . ,"[713] or even as all these together. The troparia—related to the invocation of the Holy Spirit that would take place right after—were not prevalent everywhere, and the tendency existed for them to be left out, because they indeed interrupted the continuity of the entire mystery at its most vital point. However, the triple prostration that is also older, with the short prayer that accompanies it, "O God, have mercy on me the sinner"—also said even nowadays by the priest "to himself"—constitutes an intercalated and later element, which nevertheless, an internal need of the celebrants created. This is because it does not have the character of the veneration of the gifts, which have not yet been consecrated, but constitutes a practice of the priest's contrition, who before the invocation of the Holy Spirit for the gifts' consecration, feels all his sinfulness and human weakness, and asks God to show mercy and to pardon him for his daring beyond hu-

709. "Ὁ Θεὸς, ἱλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ."

710. "Κύριε, ὁ τὸ πανάγιόν σου Πνεῦμα [ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ὥρᾳ τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις σου καταπέμψας, τοῦτο, Ἀγαθέ, μὴ ἀντανέλῃς ἀφ' ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' ἐγκαίνισον ἡμῖν τοῖς δεομένοις σου]." "O Lord, who did send down your Most Holy Spirit at the third hour upon your apostles, take him not from us, O Good One, but renew him in us who pray to you."

711. "Καρδίαν καθαρὰν κτίσον [ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πνεῦμα εὐθὲς ἐγκαίνισον ἐν τοῖς ἐγκάτοις μου]." "A pure heart, create in me, O God, and renew a right spirit within me" (Ps 50:12).

712. "Μὴ ἀπορρίψῃς με ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου [καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα σου τὸ ἅγιον μὴ ἀντανέλῃς ἀπ' ἐμοῦ]." "Cast me not away from your presence and take not your Holy Spirit from me" (Ps 50:13).

713. "Ὅτε καταβὰς [τὰς γλώσσας συνέχεε, διεμέριζεν ἔθνη ὁ Ὕψιστος· ὅτε τοῦ πυρὸς τὰς γλώσσας διένειμεν, εἰς ἑνότητα πάντας ἐκάλεσε, καὶ συμφώνως δοξάζομεν τὸ Πανάγιον Πνεῦμα]." "When the Most High came down, he confounded the tongues, he divided the nations. When he dispensed the tongues of fire, he called all to unity, and in unison we glorify the Most Holy Spirit." This is the kontakion of Pentecost.

manity. This prostration and prayer take place three times, through the influence of the sacred number, three, of the persons of the Holy Trinity, as we have also written in connection with another question.

## 105

**If a certain priest does not take part in the Liturgy, yet wishes to commune, how will he commune? Will he take holy communion by himself, as if he served, or will the officiating priest commune him, like he also communes the deacon?**

The presbyters and the deacons preserved the ancient manner of holy communion, which also applied to the faithful in the ancient church. Namely, they first received the Precious Body and then the Precious Blood directly from the holy chalice. And if they serve, the manner of approaching for holy communion is well known. Again, if they do not serve, they keep by tradition the same privilege. Namely, at the time of the koinōnikon, they vest themselves with the distinctions of their rank, namely, the epitrachēlion or the orarion respectively, join in the preparatory prayers of the celebrant, and commune, whatever offikion they might also have, immediately after the serving priest even before the collection[714] of the Holy Elements into the holy chalice, alone, except the deacon, to whom the priest imparts holy communion in the customary manner. They afterwards participate in the thanksgiving and remove the distinctive vestments of their rank.

With the labis, holy communion is imparted to them only in an instance of a sickness that prevents communion in the above manner at the time of the Divine Liturgy, or also if again due to sickness or advanced age while they are present at the Divine Liturgy, they are unable to commune alone, or a danger exists that they would cause some accident. Namely, also in this case, the practice of the ancient church for the sick is implemented, to whom holy communion was given by the labis, and which eventually became prevalent for all the faithful.

714. "συστολή." See question 102 for a discussion of this term.

## 106

**During the partaking of the Precious Blood, some say "In the name of the Father, Amen, and the Son, Amen, and so forth," but others are content with "Amen, Amen, Amen." What is more correct?**

## 107

**During the partaking of the holy chalice, is it correct for the priest to commune three times while bringing the chalice thrice to his lips ("In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit") or only one time, as some maintain?**

According to the ancient practice of the Church, the celebrants, like also the laity, received from the holy chalice only one time. The phrase, "Blood of Christ"[715] or "Blood of Christ, cup of life,"[716] and the communicant responding "Amen," accompanied communion. Kyrillos of Jerusalem (*Mystagogic Catechesis 5*, 21–22),[717] the *Apostolic Constitutions* (8.13),[718] and other ancient writers attest to this. Later, more complex phrases were introduced, which are attested to by ecclesiastical writers and by manuscripts of the Divine Liturgy. Eventually, the well-known formula, "The precious and all holy and lifegiving Blood . . . in the name of the Father . . . ,"[719] became prevalent. It appears that "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, Amen," was also said during the partaking of the Precious Body, like it is said nowadays during the partaking of the Precious Blood. At least, the scroll of the Monastery of Esphigmenou from the year 1306 attests to this: "And taking the Holy Bread in his right hand, making a cross with it three times in front, he says, 'In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.'" However, the clergy did not commune three times, either from the

715. "Αἷμα Χριστοῦ."

716. "Αἷμα Χριστοῦ, ποτήριον ζωῆς."

717. Kyrillos of Jerusalem, *Mystagogic Catechesis* 5.21–22 in *Catéchèses Mystagogiques*, ed. Auguste Piédagnel and trans. Pierre Paris, SC 126 (Paris: Cerf, 1966), 170–173.

718. *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.13.15 (SC 336:210–211).

719. "Τὸ τίμιον καὶ πανάγιον καὶ ζωηρὸν Αἷμα . . . εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρός..."

Holy Bread or from the chalice, but only once. Codex 120 of the Monastery of Esphigmenou from the year 1602, as far as I know, alone presents an exception, which records that the priest, "received three times" also from the Precious Body. The triple communion of the chalice was introduced apparently in a subsequent period through the protraction of invoking the names of the Holy Trinity. In this way, the manuscript under number 425 of the sixteenth century of the Metochion of the Precious Cross in Constantinople has, "In the name of the Father," without prescribing, at least expressly, the triple communion, but the manuscripts *Sinai 986* of the fifteenth century and *Athens 702* of the sixteenth century concurrently with the invocation of the names of the Holy Trinity expressly state that the communion of the priest and deacon took place three times from the chalice. The first characteristically notes: "When the priest also takes the holy chalice, he communes, saying, 'The servant of God, [name] the priest partakes of the precious and holy . . . .' And he receives three times from it. Likewise, they also distribute to the deacon, who each partake three times from it . . . ," and the second manuscript during the communion of the deacon attests that the priest said, "In the name of the Father . . . ," and the deacon after the triple communion responding, "Amen." According to an older manuscript, the scroll under number 719 of Patmos of the thirteenth century, the priest when communing said, "Cup of salvation . . . In the name of the Father, Amen, and of the Son, Amen, and of the Holy Spirit, now and ever and unto the ages of ages, Amen." Moreover, many manuscripts from the fourteenth century onward, which contain Liturgies or the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos (*Esphigmenou 120, Panteleēmonos 6277 -770, National Library of Athens 751, 752, 766, 782, 878*, and others), as well as all the printed editions prescribe the triple communion from the chalice, without often stating explicitly that the triple partaking was also accompanied by the invocation of the three persons of the Holy Trinity.[720] If we take under consideration that both the *Diataxis* of Philotheos and the standard rubrics that were inserted into the Di-

720. For *Panteleēmonos 6277–770*, see Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 14.

vine Liturgy did not prescribe new things, but recorded the already existing practice, which was supported in the preexisting liturgical tradition, we understand that the triple communion from the chalice is also not as late a custom, as it appeared at first glance.

Regarding the triple communion, the somewhat far-fetched explanation was usually given that "Christ who resides in the Christian faith, resides together with His Father and the Holy Spirit" (Theophilos of Kampania, *Treasury of Orthodoxy*, seventh edition, [Thessaloniki, B. Rēgopoulos], p. 49).[721] There exist very many such influences of the sacred number three at various points of divine worship. The ancient practice would perhaps be preferable, but the triple communion has already become prevalent and certainly for quite a long time.

During our own times, Fr. Gervasios Paraskevopoulos has been in favor of communion only one time from the chalice (*Topical Problems*, part 1, 1954, pp. 119–120 and *An Interpretative Overview on the Divine Liturgy*, 1958, p. 245, footnote 2).[722] Outside of historical reasons, he also invoked the opinion of Ecumenical Patriarch

721. Θεόφιλος, Ἐπίσκοπος Καμπανίας, *Ταμεῖον Ὀρθοδοξίας περιέχον συνοπτικῶς καὶ διαλαμβάνον περὶ Θεοῦ, περὶ Πίστεως, περὶ ἐξηγήσεως καὶ χρήσεως τῶν ἑπτὰ Μυστηρίων, δέκα Ἐντολῶν, καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαιοτέρων τῆς Ἱερᾶς Ἐκκλησίας ἐθίμων*, 7th ed. (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, n.d.), 49. Theophilos (ca. 1715–d. after 1793), born in Ioannina, was bishop of Kampania (1749–1795), teacher, and scholar. He was best known for the *Ταμεῖον Ὀρθοδοξίας*, which was first published in 1780 in Venice and subsequently republished as a popular work in successive editions. This work is a series of theological questions and responses composed in 110 short chapters and written in vernacular Greek. Saint Athanasios Parios (Ἀθανάσιος ὁ Πάριος) (1722–1813) wrote the introduction. In addition, Theophilos authored a legal writing entitled, *Νομικόν*, which is divided into two parts that cover ecclesiastical and civil law, as well as a number of lesser works. In his writings, Theophilos was highly influenced by Eugenios Voulgarēs (Εὐγένιος ὁ Βούλγαρης) (1716–1806), one of the most important theologians and churchmen of this period. This discussion is based on Gerhard Podskalsky, *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft, 1453–1821* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1988), 354–356, and Νικηφόρος Λ. Φορόπουλος, "Θεόφιλος, Ἐπίσκοπος Καμπανίας," in *ΘΗΕ* 6:405-407.

722. Γερβάσιος Χαρ. Παρασκευόπουλος, *Ἐπίκαιρα Προβλήματα* (Ἀθῆνα: n.p., 1954), 119–120; *Ἑρμηνευτικὴ ἐπιστασία ἐπὶ τῆς θείας λειτουργίας* (Πάτραι: n.p., 1958), 245 n. 2.

Kōnstantinos VI,[723] as well as practical reasons, namely, the danger of consuming such a great proportion of the Precious Blood to not have left enough necessary for distribution to the people. Certainly, the celebrant priest and the concelebrant priests and deacons must always consider this possibility, so that it never takes place, and must suitably manage the quantity of this eucharistic species during the holy prothesis, must place in the chalice the sufficient quantity of wine proportionate with the number of concelebrants and the estimated participation of the faithful, and must be even more sparing during their communion. The return to the ancient practice is not so easy, nor perhaps even advisable since triple communion from the chalice has already become prevalent for centuries and also generally continues nowadays.

As for the particular point to which the first question is directed, it is more correct from the description of the rubrics of the codices that each individual communion is accompanied by the invocation of each single name of the persons of the Holy Trinity. Moreover, this has also been the prevailing practice.

## 108

**In the service of marriage must the priest also add both prayers "for loosing of crowns"[724] before the dismissal?**

The small service "for loosing of crowns"[725] or "for the removing of the crowns after seven days"[726] or "for loosing of a bridal chamber"[727] or "while raising the crowns,"[728] which is found at the end of the service of marriage, presents quite a bit of instability regarding its content and regarding the time and place of its celebration. Nowadays, it consists of two known prayers, "O Lord our God, who blessed the crown of the year . . ."[729] and "Having come together in har-

723. Kōnstantinos VI, ecumenical patriarch (r. 1924–1925).
724. "εἰς λύσιν στεφάνων."
725. "ἐπὶ λύσιν στεφάνων."
726. "εἰς τὸ συστεῖλαι τὰ στέφανα μετὰ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας."
727. "εἰς παστάδος λύσιν."
728. "ἐν τῷ αἴρειν τοὺς στεφάνους."
729. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ τὸν στέφανον εὐλογήσας . . ."

mony . . ."[730] (or "Having come in a bridal chamber"[731] or "Having joined together"[732] according to some manuscripts), and a dismissal. In some codices, "Blessed is our God,"[733] the trisagion, etc., and the apolytikion of the day precede. The rubrics of codices do not agree as to the time of its celebration. According to some manuscripts, it was said on the eighth day, but by others the seventh, by others the third, by others it was added to the service of marriage, and by others it was left to the discretion of the presider. It was celebrated either at the temple or at the bridal chamber. At any rate, this is a case of an interpolation, and relatively later, for which reason it also presents so much variety in form and in its rubrics, both in the manuscripts as well as in the present-day practice. The more correct thing is for the service to be read in the home or in the temple on the eighth day, as happens in many places up until nowadays. This was also the original purpose of this service; the newlyweds keeping the crowns in the "bridal chamber" until the eighth day, on which the priest read these prayers for them, received the crowns that belonged to the temple, and deposited them again in it.[734] Nowadays, this practice has changed and the service "for the loosing of the crowns" has lost its original purpose. In any event, it is a beautiful custom for the newlyweds to proceed to the temple on the eighth day of their marriage, so to speak, on the leavetaking of this feast, to enjoy once more the blessings of the Church. But if the return to this practice is not possible, it would not be advisable that these prayers are appended to the service of marriage according to the parallel example of the dismissal of holy baptism, even if this is attested to by some manuscripts or also happens in certain places. The service of marriage is sufficiently long and has sufficient similar prayers to the present ones, of which certainly the final one ("O God, our God, who was

730. "Σύμφωνα καταντήσαντες . . ."
731. "Νυμφῶνα καταντήσαντες."
732. "καταρτίσαντες."
733. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός . . ."
734. A common modern practice in many Orthodox churches is for the couple to purchase their own crowns and not use the set available from the parish temple.

present . . .")[735] was used even earlier according to the testimony of many manuscripts, like also nowadays, as a prayer of taking up the crowns.

## 109

**Is it correct for the priest to bless the antidōron after the consecration of the precious gifts?[736]**

Neither in the manuscripts, nor in printed editions of the Divine Liturgy, nor in sacred writers who commented on the Divine Liturgy or at length explained its order[737] is any witness contained that a special blessing was given to the antidōron, as we understand it nowadays and as done by many of our modern priests, as far as I know. The codices speak concerning its distribution and the prayer that accompanied this, "The blessing of the Lord upon ye [or upon you],"[738] but this prayer is not directed towards the antidōron, which is presumed to be already sanctified, but towards the faithful who receive it. According to Nikolaos Kabasilas and Symeōn of Thessaloniki, the blessing is given to the antidōron by the service of the prothesis itself. The bread of prosphora, from which the lamb is cut, "which has become holy by being dedicated and being offered to God," according to Kabasilas (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 53.4),[739] partakes of sanctification and divine blessing. Symeōn also explains more fully: "Antidōron is sanctified bread, offered in the prothesis, out of which the removed middle part was consecrated in the sacred-service, and became the Body of Christ . . . this bread is also blessed and sealed by the lance and has received sacred words . . . and a provider of a divine gift, which derives from the words in the prothesis" (*Dialogue*, chapter 100),[740] and elsewhere, "[the antidōron] is sanctified bread, offered in the prothesis, out of

735. "Ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ παραγενόμενος . . ."
736. See also question 139.
737. διάταξις.
738. "Εὐλογία Κυρίου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς (ἢ ἐπὶ σέ)."
739. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 53.4 (SC 4bis:304–305).
740. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 263.

which the middle part was removed and offered to be sacrificed in the sacred-service. Later this bread, since it also was sealed with the lance and received divine words, is provided instead of the gifts, namely, instead of the awe-inspiring mysteries, to those who do not partake of them" (*Explanation*, 101).[741] Namely, this offering of this bread during the prothesis "in remembrance of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ"[742] and its sealing with the holy lance—the "sacred words" and that entire service—give the blessing to it. Earlier, the prayer of the prothesis, "O God, our God, who did send forth the heavenly bread . . . ,"[743] which asks God to bless "this prothesis" and receive it on His heavenly altar, is said for all the loaves being offered, which for this reason were called "eulogiai/blessings."[744] Another more specific blessing than this is not provided by our liturgical practice for the bread of the antidōron.

Nevertheless, nowadays, it is well known that the priest elevates and blesses the antidōron after the consecration of the precious gifts at the time of the chanting of the hymn of the Mother of God, "It is truly meet . . . ."[745] Certainly, this is tending to be formalized by the last edition of the Hieratikon (1962), on p. 137 of which it is footnoted: "It has become accustomed in the course of this awe-inspiring sacrifice for the priest to bless the antidōron while elevating it before the precious gifts." The elevation is attested to directly by Symeōn of Thessaloniki and by a well-known codex (*Athens 776* of the seventeenth century), and indirectly by many, but the blessing by none. What is this "elevation?"[746] According to early ecclesiastical custom, which the relevant rubric of the Hōrologion dates back to the apostles, bread is elevated in honor of the Theotokos, a thing that up until the present occurs regularly in monasteries and, in some areas, oc-

741. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 157.
742. "εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ."
743. "Ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεός, ὁ τὸν οὐράνιον ἄρτον . . ."
744. "εὐλογίαι."
745. "Ἄξιόν ἐστιν . . ."
746. "ὕψωσις."

casionally in the homes of the faithful.[747] The particular devotion to the Panagia ensured that when her commemoration was heard after the consecration of the precious gifts during the Divine Liturgy, the people would burst into her hymns and praises, chanting "It is truly meet . . ." or other hymns of the Mother of God, in which also the celebrants participated, who also themselves said, according to many manuscripts, "It is truly meet . . . ,"[748] "Hail, most blessed Virgin Mary, Theotokos . . . ,"[749] "All generations call you blessed . . . ,"[750] "All creation rejoices in you, O full of grace . . . ,"[751] and "The one who received the hail . . . ."[752] Devotion to the Panagia of the priests and the people also regarded the moment appropriate for the "elevation of the Panagia"[753] to be inserted. This is attested to expressly by Symeōn of Thessaloniki as a custom quite widespread during his period, which also he appears to approve: "It is also elevated in the sacred Liturgy itself often when some are petitioning, though by custom it is done by most celebrants, who long to call upon and praise the one worthy of all praise, and more so when the mystical things of her Son and our God are sacrificed, when we also obtain greater help from her. It is elevated at that time, when also it is a custom to commemorate her during the divine mystagogy, namely at the time we say, 'Especially for our most holy,' and in all our needs and circumstances we call upon her who is a most sure help and guardian, and we obtain the greatest help by raising up this loaf, as also we have often come to know from experience and we have learned from many other trustworthy men. For not simply some things are said in the elevation, but our only God of all and in Trinity is called upon and invoked and, verily, the invocation of the

747. For additional background, see John Yiannias, "The Elevation of the Panagia," *DOP* 26 (1972): 225–236 and Ivan Drpić, "Notes on the Byzantine *Panagiaria*," *ΖΟΓΡΑΦ* 35 (2011): 51–62.

748. "Ἄξιόν ἐστιν . . ."

749. "Θεοτόκε Παρθένε . . ."

750. "Μακαρίζομέν σε πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί . . ."

751. "Ἐπὶ σοὶ χαίρει . . ."

752. "Ἡ τὸ χαῖρε [δι' Ἀγγέλου δεξαμένη καὶ τεκούσα τὸν Κτίστην τὸν ἴδιον, Παρθένε Ὑπερένδοξε, Ἀπειρόγαμε, Ὑπερευλογημένη, σώζε τοὺς σὲ μεγαλύνοντας]."

753. "ὕψωσις τῆς Παναγίας."

Theotokos and Panagia and the intercession of her help, in which are the mystery and confession of our faith, the expectation of our salvation" (*Dialogue*, chapter 357).[754] Symeōn does not say whether a new loaf was offered or if the priest used the already existing loaf of the prothesis. The elevation of the Panagia is accompanied nowadays by "Great is the name of the Holy Trinity . . . ,"[755] "Most holy Theotokos, help us,"[756] "All generations call you blessed . . . ,"[757] and "It is truly meet . . . ."[758] And these four are found in many manuscripts at this point of the Divine Liturgy, where—even if they make no mention of the "elevation"—it appears that they implied it. The first three were preserved up until nowadays in the liturgical practice associated with the blessing of the antidōron and the commemoration of the Mother of God at that time.

In honor of the Theotokos, at the time of the Divine Liturgy, the priest had two pieces of bread at hand. The one was the part of the Theotokos on the paten, which had been introduced at least a century prior to Symeōn's period, and the other was the bread of the prothesis, from which he had excised the "middle part,"[759] namely, the lamb. We have a witness that the paten's part was elevated (*Codex Athens 776*), not because it was believed by "ignorant ones" that it had changed into the Panagia's body, but in order that the "elevation of the Panagia"[760] might customarily take place with the piece that was removed in the prothesis "in honor and remembrance"[761] of her. Moreover, the symbolism of the Panagia's body was attributed to the bread of the prothesis, from which the lamb had been excised, namely, to the bread that was cut up and distributed as antidōron. This bread was taken into the holy of holies,[762] just as

754. PG 155:664a–664b. Cf. the translation in Harry L.N. Simmons, trans., *St. Symeon of Thessalonike, Treatise on Prayer* (Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1984), 97.

755. "Μέγα τὸ ὄνομα τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος . . ."

756. "Ὑπεραγία Θεοτόκε, βοήθει ἡμῖν."

757. "Μακαρίζομέν σε πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί."

758. "Ἄξιόν ἐστιν . . ."

759. "μεσαίτατον."

760. "ὕψωσις τῆς Παναγίας."

761. "εἰς τιμὴν καὶ μνήμην."

762. "τὰ ἅγια."

also she was brought into the temple when three years old, and the lamb was cut from it, just as Christ was born from her. The *Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation,* which is attributed to Germanos of Constantinople, expressly teaches this: "The type of the virginal body, the sharing of eulogia[763] and prosphora . . . The spiritual eulogia and the other provision of good things from the distribution of the bread takes place and is believed from the body of the Theotokos,"[764] as well as the *Summary Commentary* of Theodōros of Andida, "For what is the rest, the sharing of the eulogia and prosphora, if not a type of the virginal body?"[765] In more modern times, Theophilos of Kampania bestows the same symbolism, (*Treasury of Orthodoxy*, chapter 17).[766] What else then could be more natural than to be elevated, at the time that tradition desired the Panagia to be exalted, this bread of the prothesis—the antidōron—which was already considered as a symbol of the Theotokos?

Therefore, the present-day blessing of the antidōron at the time of chanting, "It is truly meet . . .," is none other than the elevation of the Panagia according to the custom that generally became prevalent, somewhat modified by a misunderstanding. The priest does not offer any word of blessing, but says what he would have said also in the service of the elevation of the Panagia, "Great is the name . . . ,"

---

763. "τῆς εὐλογίας." Here, the term means "blessing," but also is a name for the bread.

764. In the second quoted sentence, Phountoules's text lacks the words, "τῷ τῶν χριστιανῶν γένει." The full passage reads, "Ὁ δὲ τοῦ παρθενικοῦ σώματος τύπος, ὁ μερισμὸς τῆς εὐλογίας καὶ προσφορᾶς, κλᾶται μὲν ὡς ἄρτος, διανέμεται δὲ ὡς ἀῤῥήτου εὐλογίας μετάληψις τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσι μετὰ πίστεως· ὡς προσφορὰ δὲ τοῖς ἐνηνοχόσι πλήρης ἁγιωσύνης, ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων ἀντιπροσφέρεται· καὶ οὕτως ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς μεταλήψεως τοῦ ἀχράντου σώματος, τοῦ ἐξ αὐτῆς τεχθέντος Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, καὶ τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος, ὁ ἁγιασμὸς καὶ υἱοθεσία τοῖς πιστοῖς παραγίνεται. Ἡ δὲ πνευματικὴ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ ἄλλη τῶν ἀγαθῶν χορηγία, τῷ τῶν χριστιανῶν γένει, ἐκ τῆς διανομῆς τοῦ ἄρτου τοῦ σώματος τῆς Θεοτόκου γίνεται καὶ πιστεύεται," (PG 98:452d).

765. PG 140:465c. This translation is taken from Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Vol. VI, The Communion, Thanksgiving, and Concluding Rites*, OCA 281 (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2008), 713–714.

766. Θεόφιλος, Ἐπίσκοπος Καμπανίας, *Ταμεῖον Ὀρθοδοξίας*, 7th ed. (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, n.d.).

"Most holy Theotokos . . . ," and the hymn of the Mother of God, "It is truly meet . . . ," which the chanter already says, as well as "All generations shall call you blessed . . . ," which as we saw in the manuscripts, the priest said. The crosswise elevation is done just as it would also be done in the elevation of the Panagia. The misunderstanding lies in that this elevation was considered a blessing, which, in order to be more complete, is supplemented by some priests also with a crosswise blessing with the hand, in the usual manner.

Conclusion: The artos of the antidōron is not blessed either during its distribution, nor during "It is truly meet . . . ," but during the prothesis by its dedication to God, its sealing by the lance and "by the words in the prothesis." During "It is truly meet . . . ," its elevation as "bread of the Panagia" is done, according to its symbolism, according to custom, but some of the priests wrongly bless it with the hand at that time.[767]

## 110

**During the entire Paschal season, why is "Christ is risen"[768] said instead of "Through the prayers . . ."[769] while this is provided for by the Typikon only for Renewal Week?[770]**

The small prayer, the "stichos"[771] as the manuscripts call it, "Through prayers of our holy fathers . . ."[772] constitutes, according to the Typikon, "the seal . . . of every prayer and sacred rite."[773] But the correct understanding of this prayer is not this, namely, the invocation of the prayers of the holy and God-bearing Fathers of the Church,

---

767. In Greece, altar servers, usually young boys, are at times tempted to eat the bread that they cut from the prothesis loaves for antidōron. To curtail this eating, it is a custom for priests to warn their altar servers that the bread has not yet become antidōron before its elevation in the Liturgy, thus perpetuating the misunderstanding discussed above.

768. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη."

769. "Δι' εὐχῶν . . ."

770. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 41.

771. "στίχος." This can be translated "line" or "verse."

772. "Δι' εὐχῶν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν . . ."

773. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 41.

which could be thought at first glance, but of the present fathers during the service, namely of the monks who are present. As is clear, it was introduced into church services from monastic practice, where it constituted—as it also constitutes up until now—a type of sacred courtesy, and it is repeated many times in the services, especially when a priest is not present, and in daily life. As a characteristic example, we have the Liturgy of the Presanctified, which has been strongly influenced by the practice of the monasteries. During it, the repetition of "Through the prayers" is an element precisely derived from the monastic liturgical tradition. Aside from its form composed in the plural number ("of the holy fathers"[774]), the form, "Through the prayers of our holy father . . . ,"[775] as well as "Through prayers of our holy master . . . ,"[776] is also used by the monks when a hierarch serves or presides outside the bēma, as is also done in parishes.

During Pascha, the entire service undergoes a modification to be more festive and glorious. The mournful element, which dominates during Lent, gives way to the triumphant and Paschal. Also, in the same way, an entreaty, such as "Through the prayers . . . ," retreats in the face of the victorious acclamation of the risen Christ. This tendency permeates the cloistered/monastic life, and the courtesy and the greeting also themselves become Paschal. With these theoretical presuppositions, the reason for substituting "Through the prayers..." with "Christ is risen" is also understood. By strictness, this is in force only for the day of Pascha and by extension for the entire Renewal Week, which is considered one Paschal day and feast, and on the day of its leavetaking, namely, the Wednesday before Ascension.

But already both in parish temples and even in monasteries, the new tendency to substitute "Through the prayers . . ." with "Christ is risen" throughout the Paschal season has spread and nearly become prevalent. This is a case of a very congenial innovation. "Through the prayers . . . ," which found a strange application to our parish prac-

774. "τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων."
775. "Δι' εὐχῶν τοῦ ἁγίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν . . ."
776. "Δι' εὐχῶν τοῦ ἁγίου δεσπότου ἡμῶν . . ."

tice because prayers of fathers/monks not present are asked through it, and which is heard in our temples throughout the entire year, would not be the worst thing to give way to the ancient triumphant hymn, "Christ is risen," throughout the duration of the Paschal season, albeit this is not completely consistent with ancient practice and ceremonial strictness. As a result, not only the beginning, but also the conclusion of each service, will bring to recollection the Resurrection of Lord, which we celebrate throughout this season. A logical consequence of substituting "Through the prayers . . ." with "Christ is risen . . ." should also be the case when a hierarch presides outside the bēma or serves during these days, such that "Through the prayers of our holy master . . ." is not also said, a thing that sometimes is improperly heard.

## 111

**I observed a novelty in a certain temple of a large city: at the end of the polychronion of the monarchs,[777] the priest from the beautiful gate handed over the Apostolos to the reader for reading and, at "Peace be to you . . . ," received it back again and put it on the holy table. Should this be done and why?**

This is a case of an innovation that occurs from good intentions, namely, in order that the sacredness of the epistle reading and of the book that contains the epistle pericopes is emphasized, but which is unjustifiable theoretically, historically, and even practically.

The epistle reading, and the relevant book, the Apostolos, is certainly sacred due precisely to its content, which is the word of God, as the holy apostles in their epistles, while inspired by the Holy Spirit, composed it. Equally sacred are also the other liturgical books that contain readings, psalms, and hymns of the Church, such as the Psalter (which contains similarly divinely inspired psalms of the Old Testament), the Hōrologion, the Mēnaia, the Triōdion, the Pentēkostarion, the Paraklētikē, and so forth, which also themselves contain material from the Holy Scriptures—readings not just from the Old Testament, but also epistle readings such as the Triōdion has, and as

777. At the time of this writing, Greece was a kingdom.

the Mēnaia has in the Vespers for the feast of the Apostles—psalms, and sacred hymns of the Church. Nevertheless, in the attempt to emphasize their sacredness, we must not overstate matters. These books belong to the choir, which as a representative of the people of God performs the chanting in the temples, namely, a most sacred work. By analogy, if the people and its representatives, the chanters and readers who also themselves even belong to the lower clergy, were regarded as unworthy and sacrilegious, these books also ought to be safeguarded in the holy bēma, and to be kept and to be used only by priests. However, this was never contemplated by anyone. The fact that the Apostolos also belongs in the same category of liturgical books is seen not only from its preface, which is addressed to a person who belongs to the choir—to the reader—irrespective of whether rightly or wrongly the pertinent standard rubric[778] is no longer applied, but also because it contains both the antiphons of the feasts and the koinōnika, namely elements of the service belonging to the choir. Of the liturgical books, the Gospel alone is deemed worthy of special honor, since it contains the life and words of the Lord and represents Him the incarnate Word, the Savior; and it alone is kept on the holy table, the throne of the King of Glory (indeed, the Slavs do not even place the service book of the Liturgy on the altar), and only the upper clergy hold and read it, and, before it, light lamps and burn incense. A similar rubric for the Apostolos does not exist in a manuscript or in a printed Typikon, either that the book of the Apostolos is placed on the holy table or that it is given by the priest to the reader. But there is also a practical reason that compels the Apostolos to be found on the analogion.[779] Out of a minimum sense of responsibility towards the sacred work entrusted to him and towards the congregation that will hear the reading, the one who will read it ought to have read the text in ad-

778. The standard rubric (the Apostolos being kept by the reader in the choir) is not applied when the Apostolos is kept on the holy table, given by the priest to the reader, and returned at the conclusion of reading.

779. "ἀναλόγιον" can be translated here as "lectern." In parish practice, the analogion is often a multi-sided slanted stand incorporating shelving space for the storage of liturgical books. It is sometimes described in English as the "chanting stand."

vance—which is admittedly not easy in language and in meanings—if not in his home, at least during a period of time that precedes its reading. The priest must focus his attention in this direction, if he wishes to emphasize the sacredness of the epistle reading. Instead of encompassing the Apostolos with a solemnity unknown in the history of the Divine Liturgy, the priest must discuss, and advise, request, and require the reader to study the sacred text beforehand and to recite with fear of God, without show, simply and clearly, without mistakes, of which frequently all of us are unfortunately witnesses.[780]

## 112

**On Great Saturday in the dismissal of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, why do we say, "May He who rose from the dead,"[781] if the Resurrection has not yet taken place?**

## 113

**Must or must not the dismissal of Vespers on Saturday be accompanied with the characteristic, "May He who rose from the dead?"**

Both these questions are essentially referring to the same subject. The dismissal of the Liturgy of Great Saturday is the dismissal of the Vespers of Pascha, the annual great feast of the Lord, whose image is the weekly Pascha, Sunday.[782] Both cases must be addressed in the same way.

In liturgical practice nowadays, and in both cases, there exists a disagreement. The traditional Paschal/resurrectional dismissal is "May He who rose from the dead," which precedes the regular dismissal, "May Christ our true God . . . ,"[783] as characteristic of the feast. The disagreement consists of whether the resurrectional dis-

780. Author's footnote: The archimandrite Father P. Athanasiou supported a different point of view, see *Ὁ Ἐφημέριος* 17 (1968): 40–41. We will return again to this topic below.

781. "Ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν."

782. Phountoulēs is also referring to the fact that the Greek word for Sunday, "ἡ Κυριακή," literally means, "the day of the Lord."

783. "Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ."

missal must be said also in Vespers or only in the Midnight Office, Matins, Hours, and the Liturgy of Sunday. Those who do not say "May He who rose from the dead" at Vespers cite the reason that the Lord was resurrected at midnight, and consequently, during the Vespers of Saturday, he was still found in the tomb. The second group cites the parallel of the feasts of the Lord and, in general, the understanding of the ecclesiastical day. In accordance with the ancient Judaic way of reckoning the hours of day and night, the day liturgically begins from Vespers and ends with the dismissal of the service of the Ninth Hour of the following day. The hymnography of the Church precisely also follows this very rhythm. This also applies to the dismissals for feasts of the Lord without any exception.

The disagreement is not recent. It has its origins in the printed liturgical Typika, and perhaps even earlier. The manuscripts do not preoccupy themselves on this point. They appoint as a dismissal for Pascha and Sundays, "May He who rose from the dead," without occupying themselves with the details of the dismissal for the Vespers of Saturday. Most times they note, "and dismissal," without specifying what this will be. The early printed Typikon of Kōnstantinos, Prōtopsaltēs of the Great Church, in a footnote on the Sunday of All Saints—which exists in the second edition, not however in the first—condemns the use of "May He who rose from the dead" in the Vespers of Saturday. He writes characteristically: "Many of the priests are accustomed to say from Vespers, 'May He who rose from the dead,' which is unforgiveable, because He was not resurrected from Vespers, but at midnight, and, on this account, it must be said during the morning in Matins and in the Liturgy" (see the seventh reprinting of the second edition, in Constantinople, 1874, p. 257).[784] Both the adjective "unforgiveable"[785] and the explanation "many of the priests" that is added, show that supporters of this practice existed even at that time, who also eventually predominated. In this way, the Committee of the Metropolitans of Ainos,

784. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικόν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 257, n. 1.

785. "ἀσυγχώρητον."

Samos, Kaisareia, and Mytilene, of the Ecumenical Throne, and the Prōtopsaltēs, G. Violakēs, which was established for the revision of the Typikon, came out in favor of the other point of view and determined that "May He who rose from the dead" is also said during the Vespers of Saturday, "following the standard of analogy and exactitude, which is also observed in all feasts of the Lord" (G. Violakēs, *Typikon of the Great Church of Christ*, Athens: M. Saliveros, 1921, p. γ').[786] Through a synodal pronouncement, Patriarch Dionysios V also approved this.[787] This Typikon also follows precisely this in its paragraph regarding Sundays, "Concerning the dismissal in general" (Chapter 16, pp. 13–14), and on the Vespers of Great Saturday (p. 365). Among the modern liturgical books, while some do not take a position regarding this question, others side with either one or the other point of view.

The oikonomos and hierarchical vicar of Skiathos of blessed memory, Geōrgios Rēgas, in his book, *Questions of the Typikon* (Athens 1954, pp. 16–17), theoretically supported the viewpoint of the Typikon of Kōnstantinos.[788] He cited mainly the Typika of Mount Athos for both historical and sentimental reasons, maintaining that the analogy of the feasts of the Lord must not be applied in our case, but historical accuracy must be applied, namely, that the Lord was resurrected at midnight. According to his writings, the service of the Resurrection would suffer much damage and lose its point, if before that service "May He who rose from the dead" was

786. "Ἡ ἐπιτροπὴ καθώρισε καὶ τοῦτο, τῇ στάθμῃ τῆς ἀναλογίας καὶ ἀκριβείας ἀκολουθήσασα, ἥτις τηρεῖται καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς Δεσποτικαῖς ἑορταῖς," Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), γ'.

787. Dionysios V, patriarch of Constantinople (r. 1887-1891).

788. Γεώργιος Ρήγας, *Ζητήματα Τυπικοῦ* (Ἀθῆναι: Συνοδινός, 1954), 16–17. Geōrgios Rēgas (1884–1961), a native of Skiathos, studied there and in Athens, was ordained in 1920, exercised pastoral and teaching responsibilities, and was eventually honored with the ecclesiastical office of oikonomos. His scholarship included special studies focused on the liturgical life of Skiathos and extensive works dealing with the Typikon. See the discussion of Phountoulēs in the introduction of Γεώργιος Ρήγας, ed., *Τυπικόν*, Λειτουργικὰ Βλατάδων 1 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1994), 7–10.

said during the Vespers of Pascha. Thus, he accepts that "May He who rose from the dead" must be said only from the dismissal of the Midnight Office of Sundays and onwards. However, he does not also apply this principle to the service of the all-night vigil of Pascha during the dismissal of the Midnight Office, where once again he considers "May He who rose from the dead" to be incompatible. But regardless of this weak point, the entire resurrectional fabric of the services of the Vespers of Great Saturday and of the Saturdays of the Paraklētikē compels, in a certain sense, the dismissal with the resurrectional character to be more correct. Namely, when we chant: "He who has shown forth the Resurrection to the world,"[789] "the one risen from the dead,"[790] "glorifying His Resurrection from the dead,"[791] "and by your Resurrection we were delivered from corruption,"[792] and "glory to your Resurrection"[793] in the stichēra of the Vespers of Pascha; "and resumed again His former state through the Resurrection"[794] in the doxastikon; "Arise, O God"[795] instead of the allēlouarion; and "The Lord awoke as one that sleeps, and is risen, saving us"[796] as a koinōnikon, and when we read the gospel, "After the Sabbath . . . ,"[797] which gives an account of the Resurrection, what exactly would impede "May He who rose from the dead" during the dismissal? Or how would it be possible to discard the resurrectional character of the dismissal from the services of the Vespers of Saturdays, when we chant: "and who rose from the dead,"[798] "to bestow the Resurrection upon the world,"[799] and "and who rose in glory,"[800] in the stichēra of the first tone; "and who rose from

789. "ὁ δείξας, ἐν κόσμῳ τὴν Ἀνάστασιν."
790. "τῷ ἀναστάντι ἐκ νεκρῶν."
791. "δοξάζοντες αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν Ἀνάστασιν."
792. "καὶ τῇ Ἀναστάσει σου, ἐκ φθορᾶς ἐλυτρώθημεν."
793. "δόξα τῇ ἀναστάσει σου."
794. "καὶ εἰς ὃ ἦν, πάλιν ἐπανελθών, διὰ τῆς Ἀναστάσεως."
795. "Ἀνάστα, ὁ Θεός."
796. "Ἐξηγέρθη ὡς ὁ ὑπνῶν Κύριος, καὶ ἀνέστη σῴζων ἡμᾶς."
797. "Ὀψὲ Σαββάτων . . ." (Matt 28:1).
798. "καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν."
799. "ἵνα τῷ κόσμῳ δωρήσῃ τὴν ἀνάστασιν."
800. "καὶ ἀναστάντα ἐν δόξῃ."

the dead,"[801] and "the Lord has risen"[802] in the aposticha of the first tone; "You did rise on the third day . . . Glory to your Resurrection, O Christ"[803] in the apolytikion of the first tone; "and He has risen from the dead,"[804] "we worship His third-day Resurrection,"[805] "the Resurrection of Christ,"[806] "He has risen as all-powerful,"[807] "in His Resurrection,"[808] "and who rose from the dead,"[809] in the stichēra of the second tone; and other similar ones in the aposticha of the second tone as well as in the Vespers of other tones?

The entire service of Pascha, which begins from the resurrectional Vespers of Great Saturday—and of Sundays, which begin as well from the resurrectional Vespers of Saturdays—is characteristic of the way in which the Church understood these time periods; as one entire whole, during which the risen Lord was glorified, and which had a profound Paschal character. During the readings of the Vespers of Great Saturday, the priests changed the endytē of the holy table and their own mourning vestments and wore white ones, and kneeling was forbidden from that time until Pentecost, as well as from the Vespers of Saturday until the dismissal of the Ninth Hour of Sunday. From previous responses (see numbers eighty-six and eighty-eight), we saw that the service of the Resurrection did not have the form that it has nowadays, namely, "the Resurrection"[810] was not the present one, but simply a slightly singular enarxis of the service of Matins. In subsequent times, when it was raised in dignity and took the form of nearly a veritable reenactment of this event—of which, the holy gospels did not preserve for us either the hour or the manner—those who split hairs began to discuss whether or not

801. "καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν."
802. "ἀνέστη ὁ Κύριος."
803. "ἀνέστης τριήμερος Σωτήρ . . . δόξα τῇ ἀναστάσει σου Χριστέ."
804. "καὶ ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν."
805. "προσκυνοῦμεν αὐτοῦ τὴν τριήμερον ἔγερσιν."
806. "Χριστοῦ τὴν ἀνάστασιν."
807. "ἀνέστη ὡς παντοδύναμος."
808. "ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐγέρσει σου."
809. "καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν."
810. "ἡ ἀνάστασις," namely, the service of the Resurrection. However, the word for the Resurrection is used here to emphasize the point of how the service came to be associated with the veritable reenactment of the event.

"May He who rose from the dead" is said before it, in the dismissal of the Vespers, which earlier constituted an integral and inseparable part of the entire Paschal all-night vigil.

Thank goodness the discussion did not continue, because it could have been expanded to the other feasts of the Lord. For example, how are said, "May He who was born in a cave . . ."[811] or "May He who deigned to be baptized in the Jordan by John . . . ,"[812] during the Vespers of the Nativity and Theophany, and so forth, while the Lord still has not yet been born or baptized respectively? The Vespers of Pascha and of Sundays are as resurrectional as the Midnight Office, Matins, and the other services of these days, just as the Vespers of the Nativity, Theophany, and other feasts of the Lord are also equally festal as are also the remaining services of these feasts. Therefore, their Vespers also justly must conclude with what is characteristic of the feast being celebrated, whether this is Pascha or any other feast of the Lord.

## 114

**What must the standard taxis of the Doxology be on the first day of the new year, given that there is no agreement among the various liturgical books and calendars?**

The service of the Doxology "on the first day of the new year"[813] is a modern service, which was drawn up, also like all similar Doxologies that are in use today in the Greek Orthodox Church, according to a particular and liturgically incompatible model. During the Byzantine period, just as today, the first of September, according to a Judaic calculation of the beginning of the year, was considered as a beginning of the new church year, and the first of January, although considered as the beginning of the civil year according to the Roman calendar, was not graced by any particular service. In contrast, the service for the first of September, as it is also preserved in the Mēnaia up until the present, contained a special canon and troparia. After the Liturgy, there was a procession, petitions, and an Hagiasmos, as

811. "Ὁ ἐν σπηλαίῳ γεννηθείς . . ."
812. "Ὁ ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου βαπτισθείς . . ."
813. "ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ τοῦ νέου ἔτους."

we can see from the manuscripts. In the printed Typikon of the Great Church, "the rite of the Indiction in the Great Church on the first of September"[814] is described as it is celebrated up until the present at the Patriarchate of Constantinople (G. Violakēs, *Typikon of the Great Church of Christ*, Athens: M. Saliveros, 1921, pp. 423–424).[815] The entire rite has a supplicatory character, is celebrated after the Divine Liturgy, and contains "Blessed is our God . . . ,"[816] the trisagion, the apolytikia (of the Indiction, of Symeōn the Stylite, and of the Theotokos),[817] the "Have mercy on us, O God . . . ," a dismissal, and the polychronion of the patriarch. This service formed the nucleus for the layout of the Doxology of the first of January in the Church of Greece. According to the Typikon compiled by the Holy Synod during the reign of Archbishop Theophilos of Athens (1862–1871), this service contained "Blessed is our God . . . ,"[818] the trisagion was omitted, the troparia of the day ("In all the earth" [819] of Basileios the Great, and "Human form without change" [820] of the Circumcision) were chanted, and the litany of peace, the exclamation "For to you are due . . . ,"[821] the doxology, the "Have mercy on us, O God . . . ,"[822] etc., the "Hear us, O God . . . ",[823] the dismissal, and the polychronion of the King were said (Kōnstantinos, Prōtopsaltēs, *Church Typikon According to the Taxis of the Great Church of Christ*, second edition, seventh reprinting, in Constantinople, 1874, pp. 258–260).[824] But the fact that the layout of the service was not appropriate, anyone can see even from a cursory examination. The

814. "ἡ ἐν τῇ Μεγάλῃ Ἐκκλησίᾳ τελετὴ τῆς Ἰνδίκτου τῇ α΄ Σεπτεμβρίου."

815. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 423–424.

816. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός . . ."

817. "Ὁ πάσης Δημιουργὸς τῆς κτίσεως," "Ὑπομονῆς στῦλος γέγονας," and "Χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη."

818. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός . . ."

819. "Εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν . . ."

820. "Μορφὴν ἀναλλοιώτως ἀνθρωπίνην . . ."

821. ""Οτι πρέπει σοι . . ."

822. "Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεός . . ."

823. "Ἐπάκουσον ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός . . ."

824. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικόν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 258–260.

omission of the trisagion of the enarxis is justified by the reason that the service is attached to the Divine Liturgy. The apolytikia are in fact the apolytikia of the day, however, they are irrelevant to the subject of the Doxology—the new year—for the beginning of which this service is conducted and not for the feast of Basileios the Great or the Circumcision. The litany of peace that precedes the doxology and the petitions that follow repeat the same entreaties, lengthen the service needlessly, and contain nothing related to the new year. The same thing applies to the doxology, which outside of the fact that it is irrelevant to the supplicatory character that the entire rite appears to have, is placed in a curious manner between both ekteneis, a strange thing liturgically speaking. The "Hear us, O God . . ." stands in the place of a prayer, again irrelevant to the purpose of the rite, while it would not have been that difficult for a couple of relevant words to be found so a new specific prayer might have been composed consistent with the tradition of the Church. In other words, for one who would view it dispassionately, the entire service would appear to be a patchwork of liturgical parts irrelevant to the occasion with nothing creative; a liturgical synaxis in which the faithful congregate for a defined purpose, for them to glorify God and pray for the new year, are saying many things and leaving at the end without them saying anything regarding the purpose for which they had assembled.

The efforts to overhaul this service, that took place later, precisely reveal how noticeable were the deficiencies of this service, which had already created a tradition, however, from which the correctors wished not to be freed. The first step took place with the publication of relevant services during 1932,[825] which the edition of the 1951 "Hieratikon" of the Apostolikē Diakonia follows, and the second step with the second edition of the same "Hieratikon" in 1962 again by the Apostolikē Diakonia, based on the Typikon that had been previously laid out in the annually published *Calendar-Typikon of*

825. *Ἱεραὶ Ἀκολουθίαι: εἰς τὴν Α' τοῦ νέου ἔτους—εἰς τὴν ΚΕ' Μαρτίου—ἐπὶ τῇ ἐνάρξει/λήξει τῶν μαθημάτων ἐν τοῖς σχολείοις—ἐπὶ τῇ ἐνάρξει πάσης ἐργασίας—ἐπὶ τῇ ἐπιστροφῇ εἰς τὴν ὀρθοδοξίαν—ἐπὶ τῇ ἀνασυστάσει γάμου διαζευχθέντων* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἡ Ἱερὰ Σύνοδος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1932).

*the Church of Greece*. The bad thing in our case is that all these forms have the approval of the Holy Synod and are published by the same official publishing house, the Apostolikē Diakonia. Justifiably so, the priest who submits the question—and many others with him—rightly wonders, which of these two last revisions is the more correct one that must be followed during the celebration of this service. The differences between both taxeis are mainly the following. According to the first, the apolytikion of the Circumcision is placed first and is followed by that of the Saint, like these apolytikia are chanted in the Hours, in the Divine Liturgy, and in other cases, while according to the second, the apolytikion of the Saint is placed before the apolytikion of the Circumcision, according to the sequence that they are chanted in Vespers, Matins, and in other cases. According to the newer taxis (1962 "Hieratikon"), after "Again we pray that the Lord our God may hearken . . . ,"[826] the "Hear us, O God..." is inserted and the special prayer on the first of the year follows, like in the Litē and Artoklasia; in which case, the prayer should be characterized as a prayer of inclination. According to the older one (1951 "Hieratikon"), the prayer is said alone without the "Hear us, O God . . . ," which is also more correct, inasmuch as according to the former way we have essentially two prayers—which are concluded with the ordinary conclusions of prayers—and the first prayer adds nothing special to the entire service; however, the first prayer existed in the taxis of the Indiction and in the older taxis of the Church of Greece, since the special prayer had not yet been composed. In any case, it must be confessed that with both these revisions, the service was improved sufficiently because the litany of peace was omitted and the beautiful special prayer for the occasion was introduced. Inasmuch as both forms have ecclesiastical approval, let our priests follow whatever they have at their disposal indiscriminately, and if they have both, let them choose the newer one, since certainly their differences are insignificant and even their errors are not mortal sins.

Let us be permitted a few words regarding a future more correct arrangement of this service. For one thing, troparia irrelevant to its

826. "Ετι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τοῦ εἰσακοῦσαι . . ."

subject[827] which have been repeatedly chanted during the service for the day, ought to be replaced by special troparia for the service of the Indiction. On September first, there are a host of beautiful suitable troparia, like the apolytikion, kontakion, and the most beautiful idiomela of the Litē, which can enrich the service. After the first lines of the doxology, special verses ought to be gathered from the psalms and chanted, as already takes place in other instances. Thus, the doxology will take the form of a special "selection"[828] from the psalms. After this, according to strictness and the usual schēma of Byzantine services, the trisagion would have a place and the apolytikia, namely, the apolytikia of the Indiction, ought to be shifted after this, which nowadays are chanted at the beginning of the service. The ektenēs ought to be enriched with special petitions, to exhort the people for a special prayer for the new year and to introduce the themes of the prayer, which will summarize and will offer these entreaties to God. Such petitions can be gathered from manuscripts or newly composed according to the pattern of ancient ones. Finally, the "Hear us, O God . . . ," given that its presence at this point creates questions and admittedly is superfluous, is good to be omitted, when replaced by the beautiful special prayer, which perhaps could be further simplified in wording and more inclusive in entreaties.

827. In other words, troparia irrelevant to the Indiction.

828. "ἐκλογῆς." With this word choice, Phountoulēs appears to be alluding to the Ἐκλογάριον, also known as a Ἐκλογαὶ Ἁγίων, which is a book chiefly containing "selected" psalmic verses or whole psalms intended to provide alternative selections at the polyeleos during Matins that are chanted during the celebration of feasts. The name of the book is derived from the Greek word for "selection" (ἐκλογή). These books are organized according to the Heortologion. On the other hand, the word, Ἐκλογάδιον (Eklogadion), refers to a lectionary of epistle and gospel readings.

## 115

**When I have a forty-day blessing or any other service (marriage, baptism, and so forth) to read and it is the day of the Ascension, Pentecost, Transfiguration, or so forth, what dismissal is done?**

It is well known that the services of the mysteries and many other rites have special features in their dismissals. In this way, "May He who deigned to be baptized in the Jordan by John for our salvation . . . ,"[829] is placed at the beginning of the dismissal of holy baptism; "May Christ our true God, who by coming to Cana declared marriage to be honorable . . . ,"[830] or according to various manuscripts "May He who declared marriage to be honorable in Cana . . ."[831] (*Panteleēmonos 364, Timiou Staurou 615*) or "May He who blessed marriage . . . ,"[832] (*Panteleēmonos 780*) are placed at the beginning of the dismissal for marriage; "May He who was born in a cave . . ."[833] at the beginning of the dismissal for the prayer for a woman after childbirth;[834] "May He who deigned on the eighth day . . ."[835] at the beginning of the dismissal for the prayer of the name-giving; "May He who deigned to be carried in the arms of the righteous Symeon . . ."[836] at the beginning of the dismissal for the prayer of the forty-day blessing; "May He who rose from the dead . . ."[837] or "May He who has the authority over the living and the dead [or "who has authority over"] . . ."[838] at the beginning of the dismissal for the funeral service; and other similar ones. In other

829. "Ὁ ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου βαπτισθῆναι καταδεξάμενος, διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν . . ."

830. "Ὁ διὰ τῆς ἐν Κανᾷ ἐπιδημίας τίμιον ἀναδείξας τὸν γάμον . . ."

831. "Ὁ ἐν Κανᾷ τίμιον ἀναδείξας τὸν γάμον . . ."

832. "Ὁ εὐλογήσας τὸν γάμον . . ."

833. "Ὁ ἐν σπηλαίῳ γεννηθείς [καὶ ἐν φάτνῃ ἀνακλιθεὶς διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν] . . ."

834. "εἰς γυναίκα λεχώ."

835. "Ὁ ἐν τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ [σαρκὶ περιτμηθῆναι καταδεξάμενος διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν] . . ."

836. "Ὁ ἐν ἀγκάλαις τοῦ δικαίου Συμεών [βασταχθῆναι καταδεξάμενος διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν] . . ."

837. "Ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν . . ."

838. "Ὁ καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἔχων [ἢ ἐξουσιάζων] . . ."

words, each individual sacred rite is placed within the framework of Christ's entire economy in such a way that each single believer lives each event of his/her life in Christ and on a personal level relives each event of His life. Both the prayers of each and every service and the Fathers who systematically (like Symeōn of Thessaloniki) or occasionally explained them, always view them with this spirit. The believer is born, receives his/her name on the eighth day, is introduced into the temple on the fortieth, is baptized, and is buried, while imitating and applying to himself/herself what Christ as man "effected in Himself"[839] according to Symeōn (*Dialogue*, chapters 42–57 passim), thus becoming one body with Christ. Each rite or mystery precisely intends to emphasize this point when recalling the corresponding event of the Savior's life through the prayers, troparia, and even a special dismissal, as this also precisely occurs in the feasts of the Lord. We celebrate again in the latter the salvific event of the life of the Lord, but again as our own personal event, inasmuch as the Savior was born for the renewal of human nature, was baptized while prefiguring our own baptism and making our own cleansing pure, and died and rose in order to become an agent of our own immortality. One can say that in the individual mysteries, the rites that are done for the faithful have a character of a feast of the Lord, inasmuch as they are celebrated in the name and in remembrance of that feast. This is also emphasized with the dismissals, which have the distinctive features of the dismissals of the corresponding feasts of the Lord. Because of this, these services are not influenced by the cycle of feasts within which they happen to be celebrated, with the sole exception of the feast of Pascha, whose apolytikion is inserted. Moreover, it also would be impossible on a practical level to combine, for example, the special dismissal of marriage with the dismissal for the Presentation or Pentecost, and so forth. No mention ever occurs in the manuscripts and printed editions regarding such an adaptation of the dismissal.

839. "εἰς ἑαυτὸν κατειργάσατο," chapter 43, *Dialogue* (PG 155:185b).

However, matters are different regarding the various services of the Church's daily prayer, the dismissals of which we deal with in another answer.

## 116

**During the present-day, if the service of betrothal is canonically performed by a priest and the marriage takes place months or a year afterwards, does the service of betrothal take place again? Furthermore, if the marriage was cancelled, what is required for the betrothal to be dissolved?**

According to the ancient practice of the Church, the service of betrothal (ἀῤῥαβῶνος), "betrothal" (τῶν μνήστρων), was celebrated separately from the service of marriage. It would not have a reason to exist otherwise. Both in the manuscripts and in our present-day Euchologia, the two services are treated separately and completely independent one from the other; they begin with blessings and conclude with distinct dismissals. However, it is also already attested by the manuscripts that it became customary that they were celebrated consecutively. And this took place in order that the financial and moral consequences are avoided that a dissolved betrothal might have. However, the memory of their separation was still preserved because while the betrothal was celebrated in the narthēx, the marriage was in the nave.

Naturally given that the benediction of the betrothal was separately done and that the same persons again came forward for the blessing of their marriage, albeit even if a long period of time intervened from the celebration of the betrothal, this service was not repeated. However, the reasons that compelled the drawing together of these services with the gradual relaxation of morals, ended up being a real danger, to such an extent that the tables were turned and the celebration of betrothal consecutively with marriage became the rule and their separate celebration the exception. For the same reasons, the prohibition of celebrating the two services separately brought an end to this exception. At first, the prohibition was ecclesiastical (Encyclical of the Holy Synod, February 7, 1834, and

April 28, 1835) and later, legal authority was established with penalties and legal consequences. The "Constitution of the Church of Greece" (Law 671/1943), which was confirmed also by Act 184/1946 of the Council of Ministers, states the following verbatim in article 52: "The benediction of betrothal separately from the celebration of the mystery of marriage is forbidden. The betrothal that is celebrated separately from marriage is declared spiritually invalid by the competent spiritual authority, and the priest who celebrated it is subject to the penalty of one year's suspension along with the deprivation of half his salary but is liable to imprisonment from three months to a year, when convicted by the Magistrate's Court in accordance with the above."

Consequently, given that the benediction of the betrothal is declared invalid and is viewed as not having taken place if it might have occurred separately from the marriage, in any case the priest will also celebrate the service of betrothal before the service of crowning.

## 117

**Is it right for pure white wine to be used in the holy chalice for the bloodless sacrifice, even if in an emergency?**[840]

Pure natural wine, "fruit of the vine" (Matt 26:29, Mark 14:25, Luke 22:18), is offered during the Divine Liturgy. The use of chemical substances or wine mixed with foreign ingredients or altered must be avoided. The "Teaching [or Explanation] for priests and deacons,"[841]

840. In the Church of Greece, there are many anecdotal accounts of various wines being used during the German occupation of World War II and the Greek Civil War when supplies and food were scarce. The question may reflect an awareness of such anecdotes. This question may also have its basis in the years following the nineteenth century global phylloxera infestation that destroyed vineyards worldwide. Central Greece experienced a renewed infestation in the 1960s and a wine shortage, which coincides with the time period of the first volume of Phountoulēs's answers to liturgical questions. The few European grapes resistant to the infestation include the white-wine Assyrtiko grape, which is dominant on the Greek island of Santorini.

841. "Διδασκαλία (ἡ Ἑρμηνεία) πρὸς τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ διακόνους." According to Phountoulēs (question thirty-nine):

In the second appendix of the first edition in a modern Greek translation of the works of Archbishop Symeōn of Thessaloniki, which was done during

which we discussed in the response to question thirty-nine, summarizes the relevant guidance as follows: "The matter of the Blood of Christ is wine that comes from the fruit of the vine, which must be good, fragrant, and acceptable for drinking and pure, must not be mixed with other beverages, outside of those from grapes . . . The broths that come from various legumes are not wine, and be on guard, but if someone might dare to use another material other than wine, either a broth or with tart wine,[842] or mixed with other material, he commits mortal sin and is defrocked" (Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Complete Works*, B. Rēgopoulos, p. 470).[843]

In the countries of the Western church, specially bottled wine of guaranteed purity is in circulation, which is used specifically for the Liturgy. In our countries, there does not exist a special provision because the adulteration and chemical production of wines were, at least presumably, unknown or the supply of pure wine was possible in our agricultural lands. As to the color, in the East, although relevant guidance does not exist, red wine is used to more closely resemble blood, but in the West, the white in order that the coverings not be stained. In a true emergency, the priest can apply the oikonomia required according to his judgment, while always abiding by the evangelical "wine" and "fruit of the vine" as a necessary presupposition. Otherwise, he is culpable of the gravest negligence and disrespect towards the mystery being celebrated.

---

1791 in Leipzig, useful instructions for the celebration of the divine liturgy are contained under the title, 'Teaching for priests and deacons.' This 'Teaching' is not a work of Symeōn, but perhaps of the translator himself, the priest Polyzōēs Lampanitziōtēs from Ioannina, yet it has been regarded 'with precision' by Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople, likely the Third (1757), and his synod. This appendix is also included, somewhat corrected, in the last reprint of this edition, which was done during recent years by the publishing house of B. Rēgopoulos in Thessaloniki.

For additional information on Polyzōēs Lampanitziōtēs, see the footnotes to question thirty-nine.

842. "ὀξίνην οἶνον."

843. Συμεὼν, Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θεσσαλονίκης, *Τὰ ἅπαντα, ἐκ τῆς ἀρχαίας εἰς τὴν ὁμιλουμένην μετενεχθέντα πρὸς ψυχωφελὴ χρήσιν τῶν εὐλαβῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἱερέων καὶ λαϊκῶν: ἐγκρίσει τῆς ἱερᾶς συνόδου τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος μετὰ πολλῶν διορθώσεων κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον κείμενον* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, n.d.), 470.

## 118

**Must "we read"[844] the "cakes of Saint Phanourios" and if yes, which prayer must be said, given that there is no relevant prayer in the Small Euchologion?**

The custom of offering cakes on the feast day of Saint Phanourios or also on other days in his honor is very modern and, along with the veneration of this saint, is tending to become widespread. It has already become nearly Pan-Hellenic because of the special charisms that are attributed, especially by lay women, to this saint, namely, the disclosure of future spouses or lost objects. This is a case of a purely folk expression that some people ridicule, others tolerate, and others censure. Perhaps the most correct treatment of this matter would be toleration. Always in similar instances, the Church followed this path; it suffices that these folk customs are not opposed to the dogma and the true spirit of divine worship. Here, essentially, there is nothing blameworthy; an offering which is taking place in honor of a saint, as the result of a certain votive prayer. Something analogous took place in the ancient church with small loaves[845] and wheaten flour[846] that women prepared in honor of the Theotokos on the day following the Nativity "on the pretext of showing honor, as it were, to the childbed of the undefiled Virgin-Mother."[847] The Fathers condemned, and the Penthektē Ecumenical Council (canon seventy-nine) forbade this custom with the penalty of defrocking for clergy and excommunication for laity. But the prohibition did not occur regarding this offering as such, but for its connection with the Panagia's parturition without travail, which was placed on par in this manner with the ordinary natural childbirth of women. If the Church thought that with the offering of cakes our spiritual worship was adulterated in any way or dogma was impacted, it would in due time take the appropriate measures, according to the principle that the canon we referenced above applies: "we submit to correc-

844. The words "we read" here imply in Greek the reading of prayers over the "cakes of Saint Phanourios."

845. "τὰ κολλύρια."

846. "τὸ σεμίγδαλι."

847. Council in Trullo, canon 79, Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:487.

tion those who through ignorance do what is improper."[848] However, without wishing to be the advocate of this simple expression of honor to the saint—where admittedly it would be preferable to have other more spiritual motives and a more irreproachable form—I do not think that it conceals some danger or some delusion. Moreover, similar offerings of bread, fruits, wine, "sacrifices,"[849] and so forth in honor of saints have or had been adopted by the Church and analogous prayers of blessing of these breads also exist in manuscripts and even in our printed Euchologia.

To the question which service must be celebrated, and particularly which prayer must be read, the answer presents certain difficulties. Customarily, if the blessing is done independently from another service, "Blessed is our God . . ."[850] and the trisagion are said, the apolytikion of the saint, "A heavenly song of praise . . . ,"[851] "Glory Both now," the theotokion "By the intercession, O Lord, of all the saints . . ."[852] follows, the prayer is read, and the entire service is concluded, as customary, with a dismissal in which the saint is commemorated. If the blessing is attached to some other service—Vespers, Matins, or even to the Divine Liturgy—only the apolytikia and the prayer are said. However, with regard to the prayer, matters are complicated, given that there does not exist a special prayer in the printed Euchologia, and it would be futile for the prayer also to be sought in manuscripts. Often, some of the priests read the prayer "for the blessing of kollyba of the saint being celebrated"[853] and others, the prayer of the Artoklasia. But the first ("O Lord, who brought all things to perfection through your word . . .")[854] makes

848. Council in Trullo, canon 79, Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:487.
849. "θυμάτων."
850. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός . . ."
851. "Οὐράνιον ἐφύμνιον . . ."
852. "Τῇ πρεσβείᾳ, Κύριε, πάντων τῶν ἁγίων..."
853. "ἐπὶ εὐλόγησιν κολλύβων ἑορταζομένου ἁγίου."
854. "Ὁ πάντα τελεσφορήσας τῷ λόγῳ σου Κύριε . . ." The full text of the prayer reads,

Ὁ πάντα τελεσφορήσας τῷ λόγῳ σου, Κύριε, καὶ κελεύσας τῇ γῇ παντοδαποὺς ἐκφύειν καρποὺς εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν καὶ τροφὴν ἡμετέραν, ὁ τοῖς σπέρμασι τοὺς Τρεῖς Παῖδας καὶ Δανιὴλ τῶν ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ἁβροδιαίτων λαμπροτέρους ἀναδείξας, αὐτός, πανάγαθε Βασιλεῦ, καὶ τὰ σπέρματα ταῦτα σὺν τοῖς διαφόροις καρποῖς

mention of an offering in honor of the saint ("these things were set forth…in honor and memory of Saint [name] . . . and to those who celebrate the memory . . . of Saint [name], whose memory we celebrate"),[855] but neither "seed and various fruits" are the offerings, nor are they set forth "in memory of those who have departed in piety and faith."[856] Even the beginning of the prayer ("who commanded the earth to bring forth all manner of fruits…who through seed made the Three Youths and Daniel . . .")[857] alludes not to loaves, but

---

εὐλόγησον καὶ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν μεταλαμβάνοντας πιστοὺς δούλους σου ἁγίασον· ὅτι εἰς δόξαν σήν, Κύριε, καὶ εἰς τιμὴν καὶ μνήμην τοῦ Ἁγίου [δεῖνος], ταῦτα προετέθησαν παρὰ τῶν σῶν δούλων καὶ εἰς μνημόσυνον τῶν ἐν εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ πίστει τελειωθέντων. Παράσχου δὲ ἀγαθέ, τοῖς τε εὐτρεπίσασι ταῦτα καὶ τοῖς τὴν μνήμην ἐπιτελοῦσι, πάντα τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν αἰτήματα, καὶ τῶν αἰωνίων σου ἀγαθῶν τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν· πρεσβείαις τῆς Παναχράντου Δεσποίνης ἡμῶν Θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, τοῦ Ἁγίου [δεῖνος], οὗ καὶ τὴν μνήμην ἐπιτελοῦμεν, καὶ πάντων σου τῶν Ἁγίων. Ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ εὐλογῶν καὶ ἁγιάζων τὰ σύμπαντα, Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ σοὶ τὴν δόξαν ἀναπέμπομεν, σὺν τῷ ἀνάρχῳ σου Πατρί, καὶ τῷ παναγίῳ, καὶ ἀγαθῷ καὶ ζωοποιῷ σου Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Its translation reads,

O Lord, who brought all things to perfection through your word and who commanded the earth to bring forth all manner of fruits for our enjoyment and nourishment; who through seed made the Three Youths and Daniel more radiant than the Babylonians who lived in luxury, Do you yourself All-good King, bless this seed with the various fruits and sanctify your faithful servants who partake of them; for these things were set forth by your servants both to your glory, O Lord, and in honor and memory of Saint [name], and in memory of those who have departed in piety and faith. Grant, O Good One, to those who have prepared these things and to those who celebrate the memory, all their entreaties that are for salvation, and the enjoyment of your eternal good things; through intercessions of our wholly undefiled Lady the Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary, of Saint [name], whose memory we celebrate, and of all your saints. For it is you who blesses and sanctifies all things, O Christ our God, and to you we send up glory, with your Father who is without beginning, and your all-holy, good, and life-giving Spirit now and ever and unto ages of ages.

This translation is modified from Hieromonk Herman and Vitaly Permiakov, *Hieratikon, Liturgy Book for Priest & Deacon* (South Canaan, PA: St. Tikhon's Monastery Press, 2017), 2:289–290.

855. "εἰς τιμὴν καὶ μνήμην τοῦ ἁγίου δεῖνος, ταῦτα προετέθησαν . . . καὶ τοῖς τὴν μνήμην ἐπιτελοῦσι . . . τοῦ Ἁγίου [δεῖνος], οὗ καὶ τὴν μνήμην ἐπιτελοῦμεν."

856. "εἰς μνημόσυνον τῶν ἐν εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ πίστει τελειωθέντων."

857. "κελεύσας τῇ γῇ παντοδαπὸς ἐκφύειν καρπούς . . . ὁ τοῖς σπέρμασι τοὺς Τρεῖς Παῖδας καὶ Δανιήλ . . ."

seeds and fruits. The prayer of the Artoklasia ("O Lord Jesus Christ, our God, you blessed the five loaves in the wilderness . . ."),[858] which is said in the present case by most priests, is relatively the most suitable, with the presupposition, that the phrase "the wheat, the wine, and the oil"[859] must be omitted from the prayer. As to the use of this prayer outside of the Artoklasia and its adaptation, there is also the precedent of its use according to the manuscripts and according to present-day monastic practice as a prayer "over the seed"[860] ("bless also this seed and increase it")[861] and as a prayer of blessing of the leaven ("bless also this leaven and increase it").[862] Thus, through this prayer, the blessing of offered loaves is sought—because essentially this is about loaves—as well as the sanctification of the faithful partaking of them. It would certainly be preferable, as long as it would be considered worthwhile by those competent, that a brief and simple as possible prayer be composed in order that our priests are assisted

858. Κύριε, Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ εὐλογήσας τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους ἐν τῇ ἐρήμω . . ." The full prayer reads,

Κύριε, Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ εὐλογήσας τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν πεντακισχιλίους ἄνδρας χορτάσας, Αὐτὸς εὐλόγησον καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τούτους, τὸν σῖτον, τὸν οἶνον, καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον· καὶ πλήθυνον αὐτὰ ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις τῶν ἑορταζόντων καὶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον Σου ἅπαντα· καὶ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν μεταλαμβάνοντας πιστοὺς δούλους Σου ἁγίασον. Ὅτι Σὺ εἶ ὁ εὐλογῶν καὶ ἁγιάζων τὰ σύμπαντα, Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ Σοὶ τὴν δόξαν ἀναπέμπομεν, σὺν τῷ ἀνάρχῳ Σου Πατρί, καὶ τῷ Παναγίῳ καὶ Ἀγαθῷ καὶ Ζωοποιῷ Σου Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

O Lord Jesus Christ, our God, you blessed the five loaves in the wilderness and from them five thousand men were filled. Bless now these loaves, the wheat, the wine, and the oil and multiply them in this holy church, this city, in the homes of those who celebrate today, and in your whole world. And sanctify your faithful servants who partake of them. For You are He who blesses and sanctifies all things, Christ our God, and to You we offer up glory together with your eternal Father and your holy, good, and life-creating Spirit, now and forever and to the ages of ages.

This translation is taken from Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, *The Divine Liturgy of our Father among the saints John Chrysostom, Large Clergy Edition* (New York City: Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, 2018), 78–79.

859. "τὸν σῖτον, τὸν οἶνον, καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον."

860. "ἐπὶ σπόρου."

861. "εὐλόγησον καὶ τὸν σπόρον τοῦτον καὶ πλήθυνον αὐτόν."

862. "εὐλόγησον καὶ τὴν ζύμην ταύτην καὶ πλήθυνον αὐτήν." See question 262 regarding the blessing of the holy leaven on Great Thursday.

and the intention of the faithful making the offering is satisfied; but this void can also be filled with the prayer of the Artoklasia.[863]

## 119

**Do we say, "May He who rose from the dead"[864] in all the dismissals and services on any day, namely, on weekdays, up until the leavetaking of Pascha?**

Throughout the entire period of Pascha, from the day of the feast up until the leavetaking, namely, up until the dismissal of the service of the Ninth Hour of Wednesday before the Ascension, the dismissals of the various services are done with the distinctive feature of this feast of the Lord, namely, with "May He who rose from the dead Christ our true God . . . ." And this is done because all these days have a resurrectional character, while being considered as a continuation of the great feast itself. For precisely this reason, throughout all these days, "Christ is risen"[865] is chanted at the beginning and at other places of the services during these days, the "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ"[866] before the Fiftieth Psalm during the service of Matins, as well as resurrectional stichēra, kathismata, and the remaining troparia. As a rule, the distinctive feature, "May He who rose from the dead," always precedes in the dismissals of those days, during the services of Matins where "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ" is said, namely, during the Sundays of the year if a feast of Lord does not fall on them, the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, the Saturday of Lazarus, and these forty Paschal days. A note of the Typikon in current use precisely formulates this principle with reference to the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross: "On the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, the resurrectional dismissal is said

863. Author's footnote: His Eminence Metropolitan Timotheos Matthaiakēs (Τιμόθεος Ματθαιάκης) of Marōneia composed a prayer "for blessing loaves of Saint Phanourios," *Εὐχαὶ εἰς διαφόρους περιστάσεις*, 2nd ed. (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1971–1972), 1:79–80.

864. "Ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν . . ."

865. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη . . ."

866. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι."

on whatever day the feast happens to be, because we say 'Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ' in the Matins" (G. Violakēs, *Typikon of the Great Church of Christ*, Athens: M. Saliveros, 1921, Chapter 16, Concerning the dismissal in general, p. 14).[867]

## 120

**Is the characteristic of the dismissal for the feasts of the Lord said only on the feast and its leavetaking, or on the days in between?**

According to old practice, the characteristic of each feast of the Lord, which is placed at the beginning of the dismissal, is said as a rule only on the day of the feast and during its leavetaking. The modern tendency, for the dismissals of the services of all the intervening days from the day of the feast up until its leavetaking to be made the same as regards this point, is not strictly correct. However, it gives a desirable variety and variation to the services of the liturgical year, reminds us that the feast is still being celebrated at this point, and cannot be characterized as reprehensible, given that during these days the afterfeast hymns are chanted and are considered essentially as a continuation and extension of the feast. Moreover, this is regularly in force for the period of Pascha, during all the days of which "May He who rose from the dead"[868] is said in the dismissal. Only during the afterfeast days of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross would it not be correct that this practice be extended and the distinctive feature of the dismissal of that feast ("May He who rose from the dead") be said, given that these days are deprived of the necessary resurrectional character. The rubric of the Typikon also attests that during the afterfeast days of other feasts of the Lord a general rule has already developed that the dismissal takes place with the characteristic of the feast, according to which, during the afterfeast Sundays the dismissal combines both characteristics, namely, the characteristic of the feast that it happens to be, and the characteristic of the Sunday, according to the example in the Typikon: "May

867. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 14.

868. "Ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν . . ."

He who was born in a cave and laid in a manger (or "May He who deigned to be baptized in the Jordan by John for our salvation") and rose from the dead . . ."[869] (G. Violakēs, *Typikon of the Great Church of Christ*, Athens: M. Saliveros, 1921, Chapter 16, Concerning the dismissal in general, p. 14).[870]

But specifically, the dismissals of the Paraklēseis for the days of the fifteenth of August,[871] of those which fall during the period of the afterfeast days of the Transfiguration, according to this modern taxis, must be done with the characteristic of this feast, certainly given that these dismissals are not the dismissals of the Paraklēsis service, but of the afterfeast Vespers in which the Paraklēsis is inserted.

## 121

**Is it permitted for an entrance of Vespers to be done or the proskomidē to be performed without a phelonion?**

When the Vespers has an entrance, the priest must also be vested with his phelonion not only during the entrance, but during the censing, which is done by him if there is no deacon during, "O Lord I have cried."[872] This is observed nowadays in monasteries and by priests who know the ecclesiastical taxis and is attested to by the manuscripts. Certainly, the Typikon of the Monastery of the Most Holy Theotokos of the Evergetis (*Codex Athens 788*) notes the following characteristic guidance, which is given to chanters in order that they might know in a practical way when the service of Vespers will have an entrance and when it will not: "But whenever he might have an entrance . . . we judge this from the priest vesting himself with the phelonion [during the enarxis of the Vespers], and similarly the deacon vesting himself with the sticharion and censing, but if they are lightly clad so that they both have the stole alone [an

869. "Ὁ ἐν σπηλαίῳ γεννηθεὶς καὶ ἐν φάτνῃ ἀνακλιθείς (ἢ "Ὁ ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου βαπτισθῆναι καταδεξάμενος") καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν . . ."

870. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 14.

871. This is a reference to the preparation period for the feast of the Dormition.

872. "Κύριε ἐκέκραξα."

entrance will not take place]."[873] According to Symeōn of Thessaloniki, the priest is clothed during the entrance with "the priestly articles [vestments]" signifying "the Incarnation" of Christ (*Dialogue*, chapter 333).[874]

Similarly, also, the service of the prothesis is celebrated by the priest after he has first fully vested himself with priestly vestments. All the manuscripts of the Divine Liturgy and all the printed editions, as well as the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos, place the proskomidē after the full vesting of the priest and washing of the hands.[875] In order to facilitate their movement, the old-time priests were accustomed to keep the phelonion folded on their shoulders and "to pull it down" during the offering of incense at the end of the proskomidē, a thing that continues to this day on the Holy Mountain. The phelonion together with the other priestly vestments are removed only after the distribution of the antidōron is also completed. The impropriety sometimes observed, when the distribution of the antidōron is done after removal of the phelonion or also other vestments, as though this was a question of some part-time job or some manual labor to be performed by the priest, is both inconsistent with the taxis of the Church and unseemly. Certainly, according to the codices, the distribution of the antidōron was done before the dismissal, or at least before "Through the prayers . . .," as it is still done even nowadays on the Holy Mountain and in parishes during the Liturgy of the Presanctified, a thing which shows that the

873. This text appears to be taken from Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 1:515. The full text in Дмитриевский reads, "Ἐπὰν δὲ ἔχῃ εἴσοδον [Phountoulēs omits the text that follows up to the end of the brackets: ὁ ἱερεύς, ὡς πάντα τὰ σάββατα καὶ πάσας τὰς ἑορτὰς ὁμοίως καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν μεγάλην τεσσαρακοστὴν, οὐκ ἀρχόμεθα ἀπὸ Τρισαγίου, ἀλλ᾽ εὐθὺς Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν, ἐκ γ΄ καὶ τὸν ψαλμόν], τεκμαιρόμεθα δὲ τοῦτο, ἐκ τοῦ ἐνδεδύσθαι [Phountoulēs has the reading, ἐνδύεσθαι] τὸ φελώνιον τὸν ἱερέα, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸν διάκονον τὸ στιχάριον καὶ θυμιᾶν δέ, ἢ οὕτως [Phountoulēs has the reading θυμιᾶν, ἢ δὲ οὕτως] εἶναι αὐτοὺς γυμνούς, ὡς ἔχουσι αὐτοστόλους." See also the text and translation in Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations*, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 364–365.

874. PG 155:605d.

875. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 1–2.

distribution of antidōron must be considered as a liturgical practice integrally associated with the Divine Liturgy. The removal of the vestments is prescribed by the codices after it.

## 122

**May an archimandrite theologian, or one not a theologian, participate in the mysteries of the Church without wearing a phelonion, but only his epitrachilion?**

## 123

**Is a priest able to celebrate baptism without a phelonion?**

During the services of the mysteries, with the exception of confession, priests must wear an epitrachēlion and a phelonion. According to the ancient taxis, the celebration of the mysteries was interwoven with the Divine Liturgy and the priests that celebrated them wore all the vestments of the Divine Liturgy. Afterwards, for various reasons, this beautiful ancient custom began to be abandoned, but the mysteries were still celebrated with full priestly vestments after the end of the Divine Liturgy, as namely nowadays the Great Hagiasmos and the memorial services are. However, even this intermediate solution was eventually abandoned and the mysteries at present, apart from ordinations, are celebrated independently from the Divine Liturgy. However, the fact that during these, priests wear vestments other than just the epitrachēlion and phelonion is attested to not only by the contemporary practice of monasteries, by the Slavic churches, and by our own parish practice—where there are priests who are not inclined to innovations—but also by the manuscripts. Especially for baptism, they attest that "the patriarch . . . who when changing puts on white vestments and white shoes" (*Codex Athens 662*), or that "the priest" comes to the baptismal font "vested in a phelonion, an epitrachēlion, and epimanikia" (*Lavras Θ 88*), or "is vested with his phelonion and manikia" (*Athens 665*). In the case of baptism, the excuse is not valid that the phelonion impedes the priest's movement or becomes soiled, since it can easily either be held from the back or be fastened at the time of the baptism or worn folded on the shoul-

ders as the old-time priests did at baptism and the prothesis, and when made from a simple linen material it can be washed frequently and always remain clean. For the service of marriage, it is again attested that the priest celebrated "while wearing the sacred vestments" (*Codex Athens 668*) or "with his phelonion" (*Lavras Λ 105*).

This taxis applies for all priests, married and celibate. In the celebration of divine worship, there is no special Typikon for the latter and, apart from the special vestments that relevant ecclesiastical tradition prescribes for a differentiation of their offices, they celebrate the mysteries as presbyters in the rank to which they belong. Precisely their status as monastic priests requires them to provide the example in observance of ecclesiastical strictness. Certainly, the liturgical tradition knows precisely the opposite from what is done by some. Namely, the one taking the lead in the celebration of a mystery or rite vests more fully than his concelebrants. For example, this is prescribed in the service of the Great Hours, the Vespers of Great Friday, and the Vespers of "Agape" of the Sunday of Pascha.

## 124

**What is the correct dismissal for the feast of the Annunciation of the Theotokos, given that things are confused? The *Calendar* published by the Apostolikē Diakonia mentions one thing and the Hieratikon, again published by the Apostolikē Diakonia something else.**

As is well known, the feasts of the Lord have special dismissals. Before the ordinary beginning of the dismissal, "May Christ our true God . . . ,"[876] a phrase characteristic of the feast precedes, namely, "May He who rose from the dead"[877] for Pascha and Sundays, "May He who was born in a cave and laid in a manger for our salvation"[878] for the Nativity, "May He who deigned on the eighth day to be cir-

876. "Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ."
877. "Ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν."
878. "Ὁ ἐν σπηλαίῳ γεννηθεὶς καὶ ἐν φάτνῃ ἀνακλιθεὶς διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν."

cumcised in the flesh for our salvation"[879] for the Circumcision, and so forth. These are not only found in special tables in the Euchologia and Hieratika, but they are sometimes also noted in relevant general or special rubrics of the Typikon for each feast. They have not been especially studied in order that we might discover the history, the development, and the variations that these dismissals present in the manuscript tradition. However, from as much as one can research here and there, it is clear that a stable tradition did not exist either as regards to the number of feasts that have a special dismissal or as regards to the form of each of these. Certainly, it appears that initially the celebrants on the basis of some relevant oral tradition suitably adapted dismissals of the feasts of the Lord, as the *Codex Megistēs Lavras Δ 80* characteristically notes: "if it is a feast of the Lord [the priest says] a suitable [dismissal] for the feast." However, various traditions were created in this way, the traces of which we find mainly in later manuscripts that do not simply note "and dismissal" or "and he makes a final dismissal." This fluctuation is still observed also in printed editions. As an example, I refer to "May the Lord who is coming towards his voluntary passion"[880] of the first days of Great Week, where it is missing from many manuscripts and printed editions—as well as the special dismissal of the Sunday of Thomas, "May He who trampled on death and instructed Thomas,"[881] which one encounters in the Italo-Greek liturgical tradition—and the different form under which other dismissals take, such as the Nativity ("May he who was born from a Virgin . . ."[882] or "May He who was born in Bethlehem…"[883] or "May He who was born in a cave . . ."[884]), Theophany ("May He who was baptized in the Jordan for our purification . . ."[885] or "May He who in the Jordan by

879. "Ὁ ἐν τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ σαρκὶ περιτμηθῆναι καταδεξάμενος διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν."

880. "Ἐρχόμενος ὁ Κύριος πρὸς τὸ ἑκούσιον πάθος."

881. "Ὁ τὸν θάνατον πατήσας καὶ τὸν Θωμᾶν πληροφορήσας."

882. "Ὁ ἐκ Παρθένου τεχθείς . . ."

883. "Ὁ ἐν Βηθλεὲμ γεννηθείς . . ."

884. "Ὁ ἐν σπηλαίῳ γεννηθείς . . ."

885. "Ὁ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν κάθαρσιν ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ βαπτισθείς . . ."

John . . ."[886]), the Exaltation of the Precious Cross ("May He who voluntarily was raised on the Cross . . ."[887] or "May He who rose from the dead . . .[888]), and so forth.

This instability of the tradition is most characteristic in the feast of the Annunciation. This feast as one of the Mother of God should not have a special dismissal, just as the other feasts of the Mother of God—of the Birth, Entrance, and Dormition of the Theotokos—do not have one. The Annunciation is not only a feast of the Mother of God, but is also at the same time a feast of the Lord, because during the feast we do not simply celebrate an event in the life of the Theotokos, just as in the others, but we celebrate a landmark in our salvation through Jesus Christ, namely, His Incarnation from the Virgin Mary. Precisely because of its special character, this feast also has the characteristics of a feast of the Lord: a special eisodikon ("Proclaim from day to day the good tidings of the salvation of our God")[889] and a special ephymnion in the second antiphon ("He who was incarnated for us . . ."),[890] elements of which the feasts of the Mother of God lack. The feast of the Meeting of Christ, which is at the same time a feast of the Mother of God and of the Lord, also falls into precisely the same circumstance. If we wished to represent the feasts of the Mother of God and the feasts of the Lord with two circles, we would place both these feasts at the points where both circles intersect, in such a way, so that they belong to both festal circles at the same time. The feast of the Meeting of Christ has all the traits of a feast of the Lord, namely, an eisodikon, an ephymnion, and a special dismissal ("May He who deigned to be held in the arms of the righteous Symeon for our salvation").[891] By analogy, the feast of the Annunciation should also have a special dismissal.

However, in practice, whether or not the feast of the Annunciation has a special dismissal as well as its form have not been com-

886. "Ὁ ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου . . ."
887. "Ὁ ὑψωθεὶς ἐν τῷ Σταυρῷ ἑκουσίως . . ."
888. "Ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν . . ."
889. "Εὐαγγελίζεσθε ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν."
890. "Ὁ δι' ἡμᾶς σαρκωθείς . . ."
891. "Ὁ ἐν ἀγκάλαις τοῦ δικαίου Συμεὼν βασταχθῆναι καταδεξάμενος διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν."

pletely crystalized. In this way up until the present, some make a dismissal simply with "May Christ our true . . ."[892] others place before this the simpler "May He who was incarnate for us"[893] consistent with the ephymnion as a special dismissal, or "who deigned to be incarnate"[894] consistent with the model of dismissals from other feasts of the Lord, or others use ones more complicated and theological, such as "May He who deigned to be incarnate by the divine coming of the All-holy Spirit and by the good will of the Father for our salvation"[895] or "May He who deigned to be incarnate by the Holy Spirit and of the Virgin Mary for us men and our salvation."[896]

It was written that "it is well known from the whole liturgical tradition that there is no recorded special dismissal for the feast of the Annunciation in any liturgical book of the Orthodox Church" (*Calendar-Typikon of the Church of Greece of the year 1967*, edition of Apostolikē Diakonia, p. 74).[897] This is not accurate. A special dismissal under the form "May He who deigned to be incarnate by the Holy Spirit and of the Virgin Mary for us men and for our salvation"[898] is prescribed by the Hieratikon of the same press of the Apostolikē Diakonia of the Orthodox Church of Greece of the year 1962, p. 25. The same dismissal is recorded also in the *Church Calendar* published "with the supervision of the Synodal Committee" of the years 1956, 1957, and 1958. Under different variations, this same special dismissal is also contained in the *Church Calendar Handbook* of Emm. Pharlekas (n.p., 1953) and in the *Taxis of the Sacred Services*, which is published annually by G. Bekatōros.[899]

---

892. "Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινός . . ."

893. "Ὁ δι' ἡμᾶς σαρκωθείς."

894. "σαρκωθῆναι καταδεξάμενος."

895. "Ὁ εὐδοκίᾳ Πατρικῇ καὶ Πνεύματος παναγίου ἐπελεύσει θείᾳ σαρκωθῆναι καταδεξάμενος διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν."

896. "Ὁ δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου σαρκωθῆναι καταδεξάμενος."

897. *Ἡμερολόγιον-Τυπικὸν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος), 74.

898. "Ὁ δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου σαρκωθῆναι καταδεξάμενος."

899. Ἐμμ. Φαρλέκας, *Ἐγκόλπιον Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν Ἡμερολόγιον* (n.p., 1953); Γ. Μπεκατῶρος, *Τάξις τῶν Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1951–1993).

Moreover, the Typikon of the Great Church of Christ of G. Violakēs knows of the existence of a special dismissal for the feast of the Mother of God of the Annunciation, as well as for that of the Meeting of Christ, even if it does not expressly mention what it is ("But note that only the two feasts of the Mother of God, that of the Annunciation and that of the Meeting of Christ, have special characteristics in the dismissal, which . . .," chapter 16, Athens: M. Saliveros, 1921, p. 14).[900] In addition, the account is also inaccurate that the special dismissal of the feast of the Annunciation "was published in print for the first time" in the Hieratikon of the Apostolikē Diakonia of the year 1962 (G. Bekatōros, *Taxis of the Sacred Services,* 1965, p. 90). In the publication of the three liturgies that took place in 1858 in Constantinople by G. Prōtopsaltidēs "with ecclesiastical permission" and which had "been scrutinized meticulously and enriched with well devised notes from His All Holiness and Eminence Patriarch Kōnstantios I of Constantinople[901] from Sinai" and republished in Athens in 1865 and in Constantinople in 1875, a special dismissal for the feast of the Annunciation is prescribed under the form, "May He who deigned for our sake to be incarnate for our salvation"[902] (publication of Athens 1865, p. 142,[903] Constantinople 1875, p. 159[904]).

---

900. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 14.

901. Kōnstantios I of Constantinople (1770–1859, r. 1830–1834).

902. "Ὁ δι' ἡμᾶς σαρκωθῆναι καταδεξάμενος διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν."

903. Γεώργιος Κ. Πρωτοψαλτίδης, *Αἱ Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι τῶν ἐν Ἁγίοις Πατέρων ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου καὶ Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου σὺν τῇ τῶν Προηγιασμένων, μετὰ τοῦ Λυχνικοῦ Ὄρθρου, καὶ τοῦ Ἱεροδιακονικοῦ, Ἀκριβῶς ἐπιθεωρηθεῖσαι καὶ πλουτισθεῖσαι δι' ὑποσημειώσεων περιέργων, παρὰ τοῦ παναγιωτάτου καὶ σεβασμιωτάτου Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Κωνσταντίου τοῦ Α'. τοῦ ἀπὸ Σιναίου* (Ἀθῆναι: Π. Β. Μωραϊτίνη, 1865), 142.

904. Γεώργιος Κ. Πρωτοψαλτίδης, *Αἱ Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι τῶν ἐν Ἁγίοις Πατέρων ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου καὶ Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου σὺν τῇ τῶν Προηγιασμένων, μετὰ τοῦ Λυχνικοῦ Ὄρθρου, καὶ τοῦ Ἱεροδιακονικοῦ, Ἀκριβῶς ἐπιθεωρηθεῖσαι καὶ πλουτισθεῖσαι δι' ὑποσημειώσεων περιέργων, παρὰ τοῦ παναγιωτάτου καὶ σεβασμιωτάτου Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Κωνσταντίου τοῦ Α'. τοῦ ἀπὸ Σιναίου* (Κωνσταντινούπολις: ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1875), 159.

I do not know if a special dismissal of the Annunciation is also attested to in the manuscripts. They have not been especially studied nor their relevant sections published. In as many manuscripts as I could examine, a dismissal did not exist for this feast. And most likely it does not also exist in others, and for this reason it is not found in old, printed editions. But although it is not attested to by the manuscript tradition, the dual character of this feast and the parallel of the celebration of the Meeting of Christ would compel some special dismissal to be inserted. And this must be short, simple, and succinct as possible. Namely, either "May He who deigned to be incarnate for our sake,"[905] must be preferred as short, or "May He deigned to be incarnate by the Holy Spirit and of the Virgin Mary for us men and for our salvation"[906] must be preferred as more complete and as based on the already well-known verses learned by heart of the Sacred Symbol. "May He who deigned to be incarnate by the divine coming of the All-holy Spirit and by the good will of the Father for our salvation"[907] is excessively long and overdone, and "May He who deigned for our sake to be incarnate for our salvation"[908] repeats the same things twice with other words. Such supplementations of church services are legitimate and needed, did not stop taking place from the beginning, and will not stop or must never stop, because our divine worship is living and is found in continual development. It is attested to by the manuscript tradition and the progress that is represented in printed editions and even in our present-day practice. As long as the additions and these supplementations are not done unplanned and without practical need. The lack of a special dismissal in the service of the feast of the Annunciation is obvious and its supplementation compelled.

905. "Ὁ δι' ἡμᾶς σαρκωθῆναι καταδεξάμενος."

906. "Ὁ δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου σαρκωθῆναι καταδεξάμενος."

907. "Ὁ εὐδοκίᾳ Πατρικῇ καὶ Πνεύματος παναγίου ἐπελεύσει θείᾳ σαρκωθῆναι καταδεξάμενος διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν."

908. "Ὁ δι' ἡμᾶς σαρκωθῆναι καταδεξάμενος διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν."

## 125

**When should the preaching of the divine word take place, after the gospel or at the time of the koinōnikon?**

The proper place for preaching in the Divine Liturgy is immediately after the reading of the sacred Gospel. In this manner, its explanation, its commentary, and the elicitation of its teachings, which are derived from the pericopes that have been read, follow the reading of the sacred text and when their words still echo in the ears of the listeners. This is how the first part, the teaching part of the liturgical synaxis, is brought to completion.

This precisely was always done in the Christian Church, according to the pattern also of the Jewish synagogue's practice. This taxis of the synagogue is attested to also by the evangelist Luke during the description of the Lord's first preaching at Nazareth. The Lord first read the pericope of Isaiah, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me . . ."[909] and afterwards in connection with this reading, "he began to say to them . . ." (Luke 4:16–27). Also, Justin the Philosopher and Martyr (d. 165), when describing the synaxis of the Christians on Sunday, states that after the reading of the pericopes from the Old and New Testament "when the reader has ceased, the presider verbally admonishes and encourages the imitation of these good things" (*First Apology*, chapter 67).[910] The catechumens, who attended the Divine Liturgy in order to hear the readings, the preaching, and, afterwards also, the prayers on their behalf that followed, departed in order that the celebration of the mystery might be continued in the presence only of the faithful. This connection between the readings and preaching was always preserved in the Church, and nearly up until our days.

However, during recent years in our Church, the transfer of the sermon from its original place to the time of the koinōnikon began to be customary. This is chiefly done for two reasons. The first is that

909. Isa 61:1.

910. Justin Martyr, *Apology on Behalf of Christians* 67.4 in *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr*, ed. and trans. Denis Minns and Paul Parvis, Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 259 (translation modified).

during the reading of the gospel all the faithful have not yet come into the temple, while during time of the koinōnikon even those most delayed are present. The second reason must be sought in the tendency towards brevity, which particularly characterizes our era. When the sermon is done at the time that the koinōnikon would be chanted, a few minutes certainly are gained, and the length of the entire service is not prolonged as much as when the homily was done after the gospel. Both these reasons are sufficiently serious, and because of this, the sermon is heard more commonly at the koinōnikon than at the gospel. Also contributing to this is the fact that the sermon is not done most of the time by the celebrating clergyman, as in the past, a thing that would prevent him from preaching during the koinōnikon.

However, it must be emphasized that this solution is not advisable, and it would be more preferable that we suffer the disadvantages of the correct practice, rather than benefitting from the transfer's questionable advantages. I say "questionable" because saving time is also not so important when the sermon is kept in its normal time limits and can be remedied when the chanting is quicker or when care is taken that the service begins five or ten minutes earlier. Secondly, the arrival of the faithful should ordinarily have taken place at least before the beginning of the readings. There certainly also are always those who are late, but it would be preferable that we accustom the people to arrive at the normal hour for church and a good sermon would very much contribute to this, which would certainly make the faithful hurry on their way to the temple in order not to be deprived of it.

The reasons that advocate for the correct practice to be preferred are mainly liturgical. Apart from the logically and historically attested place of the sermon after the readings, concerning which we mentioned at the beginning of the response, the time of the koinōnikon does not lend itself as a fitting moment for its transfer. The koinōnikon is a hymn that aims, on the one hand, to cover the time that is required for the communion of the priest, but, on the other hand, to prepare the faithful for partaking of the Holy Elements. This point in the entire sacred-service is especially appro-

priate for the preparation of the faithful, their concentration, and their penitential prayer before the most Sacred Mystery, the communion of which will take place momentarily. Certainly, a good mystagogical sermon can evoke such thoughts. But speech does not always relate to approaching for holy communion and no matter how successful it is, it will not give what is needed for this moment. It will definitely cause a disruption in the celebration of the mystery, a digression in the sacred-service that if anything will not facilitate the faithful into thinking exclusively and solely about the immortal table of the Lord, of which they are called to partake. And one more thing, when the sermon is done at the koinōnikon, it would not be an exaggeration for us to say that the impression is given that it concerns only the people and not the priest, who when preoccupied at that moment by his communion and the actions and prayers that precede and that accompany it, neither hears nor, even if he wished to, would be able to follow the things being said. However, this is not correct. On the contrary, if the sermon takes place after the gospel, the whole community, with the spiritual shepherd at its head, is seated and is listening to the word of God, which is being proclaimed, if not by the same one who presides, at least by a person who acts for him in the sacred work of proclaiming the word of God and of explaining the good news of His truth.

For these reasons, we could say in conclusion that only as an exception in extraordinary circumstances and by oikonomia could the sermon take place during the koinōnikon. Its correct place is found in the teaching part of the liturgical synaxis immediately after the readings. Nowadays, this presents certain disadvantages in practice. But neither are these so many to make its transfer necessary, nor do the advantages of the transfer outweigh the disadvantages[911] of not transferring it to the time of the koinōnikon. In addition, it would be pointless for another time to be sought for this, at least in our land.[912] In the Slavic churches, the celebrants are accustomed to preaching before the dismissal. This solution combines the ad-

911. The word "τὰ μειονεκτήματα" (disadvantages) used here refers to fewer persons listening to the sermon when positioned earlier in the service.

912. Greece.

vantages of the transfer and avoids the disadvantages of preaching during the koinōnikon. But our temperament is somewhat different. We do not have the patience needed for us to calmly follow even the best sermon, which would take place at the time when we have become accustomed to getting ready to leave. In addition, this has not been tried in our country.[913]

## 126

**Where does the difference lie between the two Hagiasmoi, specifically the first sanctification on the eve of the feast of Lights, given that both services are the same, and in what particular way is each one used?**

The service of the Great Hagiasmos of Theophany is celebrated twice according to the present taxis, on the eve of the feast after the end of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great and on the day of Theophany, after the dismissal of Matins according to the monastic Typika and printed editions, but according to parish practice, after the end of the Divine Liturgy. And in both cases, exactly the same service is celebrated with the only difference that the prologue of the great consecratory prayer, namely from "Trinity beyond all being . . ."[914] up until "seized with fear, in compunction cry out to you"[915] is read only on the day of Theophany, while on the eve, the prayer begins from, "Great are you, O Lord . . . ."[916] While this omission of the "prologue" is not provided for by the printed editions (the "it is said inaudibly," which is indicated by certain Typika, constitutes an attempt to reconcile or conceal the matter), nevertheless, it is done according to an unwritten tradition—which is older than the taxis that is recorded in the printed editions—because it is also not contained in very many ancient manuscripts, but a few that have noted it: "We do not say this prayer" (*National Library of Athens 670*), or "We did not receive from church tradition that this prayer is said; and if you wish, it is said, but begin from 'Great are you, O Lord,'

913. Greece.
914. "Τριὰς ὑπερούσιε . . ."
915. "συνεχόμενος φόβῳ, ἐν κατανύξει βοῶ σοι."
916. "Μέγας εἶ, Κύριε . . ."

according to the prescribed form of omitting it" (*Athens 663*), or "One must know that the present prayer . . . while read by some in the Great Church, is not read, but after the synaptē and the prayer above ["O Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son . . ."],[917] the priest exclaims in a loud voice, 'Great are you, O Lord . . .'" (*Hagiou Saba Hierosolymōn 367*). This "prologue" is not even a prayer, but a festive encomium of the feast, which took its present form after several modifications, additions, and deletions, and which was originally said only on the eve, but eventually prevailed rightly to be said only on the day of the feast. While the addition of this encomium makes the service more festive, this does not at all change its nature, of which, as we saw, it constitutes a later and intercalated element. Consequently, the Hagiasmos of the eve and of the feast are precisely the same, a "Great Hagiasmos" in both cases. Historically and liturgically, both of these services are one and the same service, which already by the fifth century was intended to be also repeated on the eve for the faithful to be served. In other words, initially the Great Hagiasmos was celebrated in remembrance of the Baptism of the Lord during the all-night vigil of the feast of the Theophany immediately after the service of Matins; the faithful drew water, drank, and were sprinkled, and afterwards, the catechumens were baptized in it. In the Liturgy of the feast, which was celebrated immediately afterwards, the newly illumined were also present, for this reason also "As many of you who have been baptized into Christ" is chanted during it even up until now instead of the trisagion. Essentially, the Great Hagiasmos is a blessing of the waters of baptism, with which it has so much in common to this day. The patriarch of Antioch, Petros the Fuller (465–475), first thought to make things easier for Christians and ordered the Hagiasmos to be also celebrated during the eve "in the evening." How needed and necessary was the introduction of this innovation is revealed by the rapid spread of this practice. There were originally a few differences of form between the two services, but later with reciprocal influences they became fully assimilated. To use a contemporary comparison, what happened with the Great

917. "Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ ὁ μονογενὴς Υἱός . . ."

Hagiasmos exactly occurs in our times with the two Liturgies that are celebrated in large temples of cities on the same day for servicing the needs of the faithful.

The distinction that some wish to believe exists regarding the efficacy and the use of the two, or rather of the one Hagiasmos, is not justified.

## 127

**During the fraction of the "Lamb of God" why does the deacon say, "Break, master, the Holy Bread,"[918] while the celebrant when breaking says, "Broken and distributed is the Lamb of God"[919]? Besides, when the priest or hierarch blesses the holy gifts, he does not say, "Make this bread Holy Bread,"[920] but instead "the Precious Body of your Christ."[921] After its change into the "Body of Christ,"[922] how is it possible for the "Body of Christ" still to be called "bread"[923]?**

The terms, "Holy Bread,"[924] "Divine Bread,"[925] "Lifegiving Bread,"[926] or simply "Bread"[927] are used by the Fathers and by liturgical texts to designate the Body of Christ, namely, the bread of the Holy Eucharist, not only before its consecration, but even after it. It is commonly encountered in the standard rubrics of the Divine Liturgy both in manuscripts and printed editions, like in the deacon's exhortation, which the question references, and at many other points, as for example, "touching the Holy Bread,"[928] "he makes the sign of the cross . . . with the Holy Bread,"[929] "when he is about to elevate

---

918. "Μέλισον, δέσποτα, τὸν ἅγιον ἄρτον."
919. "Μελίζεται καὶ διαμελίζεται ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ."
920. "Ποίησον τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον ἅγιον ἄρτον."
921. "τίμιον Σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου."
922. "Σῶμα Χριστοῦ."
923. "ἄρτος."
924. "ἅγιος ἄρτος."
925. "θεῖος ἄρτος."
926. "ζωοποιὸς ἄρτος."
927. "ἄρτος."
928. "ἁψάμενος τοῦ ἁγίου ἄρτου."
929. "ποιεῖ σταυροῦ τύπον . . . μετὰ τοῦ ἁγίου ἄρτου."

the Holy Bread,"[930] "taking the Holy Bread,"[931] "he breaks the Holy Bread,"[932] "he receives a portion of the Holy Bread,"[933] "he pours upon the Holy Bread,"[934] "he holds the Divine Bread in his hand,"[935] "they commune from the Lifegiving Bread,"[936] even simply "he elevates the Bread,"[937] "Prayer of the elevation of the Bread,"[938] "receiving . . . a portion of the Bread,"[939] "receiving a portion of the Bread,"[940] and so forth. The word, "Bread," is found also in hymns with the same meaning, like in the kontakion and in the oikos of Great Thursday, "Taking the Bread"[941] and "let us receive the Bread."[942]

This manner of characterizing the Body of Christ expresses anything but an attitude of its disparagement or doubt concerning the true change of the consecrated Bread into the Body of Christ. In the same sentence, the "Body of Christ," "Precious Body," "Divine Body," and so forth oftentimes come after or a little below the term "Bread," as identical. The two terms are used in the Divine Liturgy, as in the New Testament, with precisely the same meaning: "I am the Living Bread which came down from heaven; if anyone eats of this Bread, he will live forever; and the Bread which I shall give for

---

930. "ὅταν μέλῃ ὑψώσειν τὸν ἅγιον ἄρτον."
931. "αἴρων τὸν ἅγιον ἄρτον."
932. "μελίζει τὸν ἅγιον ἄρτον."
933. "λαμβάνει μερίδα ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου ἄρτου."
934. "ἐπιχέει τῷ ἁγίῳ ἄρτῳ."
935. "κατέχει τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ μετὰ τοῦ θείου ἄρτου."
936. "κοινωνοῦσι τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ ἄρτου."
937. "ὑψοῖ τὸν ἄρτον."
938. "Εὐχὴ ὑψώσεως τοῦ ἄρτου."
939. "λαμβάνων . . . ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου μερίδα."
940. "λαβὼν μερίδα ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου."
941. "Τὸν ἄρτον λαβών." The full kontakion reads, "Τὸν ἄρτον λαβών, εἰς χεῖρας ὁ προδότης, κρυφίως αὐτάς, ἐκτείνει καὶ λαμβάνει τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ πλάσαντος, ταῖς οἰκείαις χερσὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ἀδιόρθωτος ἔμεινεν, Ἰούδας ὁ δοῦλος καὶ δόλιος."
942. "τὸν ἄρτον ὑποδεξώμεθα." The full oikos reads, with the quoted phrase underlined, "Τῇ μυστικῇ ἐν φόβῳ τραπέζῃ, προσεγγίσαντες πάντες καθαραῖς ταῖς ψυχαῖς, <u>τὸν ἄρτον ὑποδεξώμεθα</u>, συμπαραμένοντες τῷ Δεσπότῃ, ἵνα ἴδωμεν τοὺς πόδας πῶς ἀπονίπτει τῶν Μαθητῶν, καὶ ἐκμάσσει τῷ λεντίῳ καὶ ποιήσωμεν ὥσπερ κατίδωμεν, ἀλλήλοις ὑποταγέντες, καὶ ἀλλήλων τοὺς πόδας ἐκπλύνοντες· αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὕτως ἐκέλευσε, τοῖς αὐτοῦ Μαθηταῖς ὡς προέφησεν, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἤκουσεν Ἰούδας ὁ δοῦλος καὶ δόλιος."

the life of the world is my flesh" (John 6:51); "This is the Bread which came down from heaven . . . he who eats this Bread will live forever" (John 6:58); "The Bread which we break, is it not a participation in the Body of Christ? Because there is one Bread, we who are many are one Body, for we all partake of the same Loaf" (1 Cor 10:16–17); and "For as often as you eat this Bread . . . whosoever, therefore, eats this Bread . . . let a man examine himself and so eat of the Bread . . ." (1 Cor 11:26–28).

## 128

**Is the priest able to celebrate a private Presanctified Liturgy? If yes, at what point of the Liturgy will he commemorate the names, because the ektenēs is discontinued at "for our Archbishop."**

To respond to this question, we must clarify two points at the same time that are touched upon by the one asking. The first is related to the particular character of the Presanctified and the second to the ektenēs, which is said after "Let our prayer rise."[943]

It is well known that the Liturgy of the Presanctified can only be called a "Liturgy" improperly and in the widest sense of the word. And this is the case because a eucharistic offering, a sacrifice, does not take place during it, like in the other two Liturgies, but Presanctified Gifts are provided during fasting days towards the end of Vespers, which has been appropriately adapted for the communion of the faithful, who remain fasting throughout the day. The celebration of the Liturgy, which has by its nature a Paschal and festive character, is not permitted during these days, due to their mournful character. Fasting and Liturgy are two incompatible things. The second brings the first to an end. For this reason, according to the oldest practice of our Church, which is in force to this day, during all the days of the Great Lent apart from Saturday and Sunday, the celebration of the Liturgy is not permitted. This is ordered by both canon forty-nine of the Council in Laodicea ("it is not permitted to offer bread during

943. "Κατευθυνθήτω."

Lent, except on Saturday and Sunday alone")[944] and canon fifty-one of the same Council, which prohibits the celebration of "birthdays" of martyrs during these days, since the commemoration of saints had a celebratory character and was associated with the offering of the Holy Eucharist in their honor ("it is not permitted during Lent to celebrate birthdays of martyrs, but to make commemorations of the holy martyrs on Saturdays and Sundays").[945] Nevertheless, since the faithful were accustomed to commune frequently and indeed, during the sacred period of fasting, desired to partake of the sanctification of the mysteries more frequently and were not satisfied by communion on Saturday and Sunday, Sanctified Gifts were reserved during the Liturgies of these days for the faithful's communion from them, even during the intermediate days of the week, as canon fifty-two of the Council in Trullo also prescribes ("on all the fasting days of Holy Lent, except for Saturday, Sunday and the holy day of the Annunciation, let the Sacred Liturgy of the Presanctified take place").[946] The present Liturgy of the Presanctified constitutes simply a developed form of this offering of Presanctified Gifts for communion, which originally took place in a very simple manner. Therefore, given that the Liturgy is not celebrated on these days, an offering also does not take place either for the living or for those faithful who have "fallen asleep." The rubrics of various monastic Typika are characteristic with regard to the offerings of the Holy Eucharist for the memorial services for brothers that died during the period of Lent, whose all-night vigil and memorial Liturgy of the third and ninth days were celebrated on the first and second Friday (into Saturday) from their death, and the forty-day Liturgies for the repose of their souls began "from the new Sunday," namely, from the Sunday of Thomas. This rubric also exists in a note in the current Triōdion on the first day of Lent, Clean Monday. We will return to this topic, when we respond to the question concerning memorial services during the period of Lent, which many priests have submitted to us. Therefore, given that during the fasting days

944. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 3:216.
945. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 3:218.
946. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:427.

of Great Lent, an offering for the faithful, living and "fallen asleep," does not take place, and the Presanctified is simply a communion of already offered gifts, the priest ought to act in good conscience, even if this would be contrary to his narrow and ill-conceived financial benefit,[947] and to explain to the faithful who are unaware that they can celebrate, if they so desire, a Liturgy only on Saturdays and Sundays and not on the other days of the week, during which, for the reasons that we explained, its celebration is forbidden, and that the Presanctified is a communion, to which the Church calls them to approach and not an offering/sacrifice.

As to the second point, namely, the commemoration of names during the ektenēs of the Presanctified, we ought to see what the liturgical tradition has to teach us regarding this part of the service. For one thing, the great ektenēs that follows "Let our prayer rise" is not an ektenēs of the Presanctified, but of Vespers, to which the offering of Presanctified Gifts is attached. Specifically, this begins from the second prayer for the faithful, in which also a special mention and prayer take place that the faithful are deemed worthy to receive the "King of Glory," whose Body and Blood are about to be set forth in a few moments on the holy table, and that they are deemed worthy without condemnation to commune of the Divine Mysteries. The ektenēs of Vespers, as we know, is the ordinary great ektenēs, in which there are prayers for all the ranks of the faithful and in which also a commemoration of the names of the living and deceased is inserted. With regard to this, the manuscripts either mention all the petitions, or even leave them out since they were known to the priests by heart. On the other hand, many manuscripts of the Liturgy of the Presanctified (the ones that do not omit the individual petitions as known) add entreaties for the emperors (*Paris 324*, *Byzantine Museum 4*, *National Library of Athens 662* and *713*), "for remission of the sins of the servants of God and all our brotherhood in Christ" (*National Library of Athens 662* and *713*), "for all our brothers who toil" (*National Library 713*), "for all who

947. Phountoulēs is referring to the practice of the faithful in providing a monetary gift to the priest when submitting names for commemoration in the Liturgy.

serve" (*Byzantine Museum 5*, *Athens 662* and *713*), and "for our fathers who have previously 'fallen asleep'" (*Athens 713*); or explicitly refer generally to petitions of the ordinary ektenēs: "the priest then says the petitions of the ektenēs" (*Paris 385* and *Athens 3097*), "The priest: 'Let us all say . . .' and the remaining supplications, making mention of the usual ones" (*Athens 769*), "then the ektenēs: 'Let us all say' and the remaining ones as is usual" (*Paris 326*), or finally, "and the priest makes mention also for the people here present" (*Paris 324*). Nevertheless, it is true that in many old and modern printed editions, the ektenēs of the Presanctified is discontinued after the petition for the archbishop, but in some cases, it is added that this takes place "according to the taxis of the Ecumenical Patriarchate." This is certainly the case of both a partial application to the Presanctified and an extension to it of the modern tendency (which also has become prevalent in the other Liturgies), namely, for the ektenēs to be omitted. If, as we have noted also on another occasion, this omission of the ektenēs has wrongly become established in other Liturgies, it is unjustifiable in the case of the Presanctified, since here there are no reasons for brevity, which we are invoking there. Consequently, the commemoration of names can be done during the ektenēs of the Presanctified, like it takes place also in other ekteneis in Vespers and Matins.

## 129

**In the celebration of the mystery of marriage is it permissible to give the common cup also to the best man (παράνυμφος) aside from the newlyweds?**

During the prayer of the blessing of the common cup of marriage, "O God, Pantokratōr, who created all things by your strength...,"[948] the wine being blessed "by a spiritual blessing"[949] is provided by God "to them that are joined in communion of marriage"[950] and not to other persons. As attested to also by all the manuscripts and printed Euchologia, the priest offered it only to the newlyweds. Certainly,

948. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ πάντα ποιήσας τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου . . ."
949. "εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ."
950. "τοῖς συναφθεῖσι πρὸς γάμου κοινωνίαν."

according to some manuscripts, after the ordinary triple communion from it, the priest gave the cup back to the bridegroom, who consumed all the remaining wine.

In many places, it is customary to offer the common cup to the best man after the newlyweds. This is a case of an unwritten, but sufficiently widespread liturgical tradition, which does not constitute an innovation, nor does it occur without reason. Just as the sponsor in baptism, the best man is the person immediately honored after the newlyweds, with whom an actual spiritual kinship is established. He is mentioned repeatedly during the service, exchanges the rings, crowns the newlyweds, dances the sacred dance with them, and, according to the Syrian liturgical Typikon, is also himself crowned. The partaking also from the common cup, a token of joy, a communion of good things, and a participation in "spiritual blessing," cannot be considered worthless and irrelevant to this sphere of honor and privileges of the best man. It is likely a remnant of an old practice and specifically of the Divine Liturgy, with which marriage was connected. Perhaps, during the Divine Liturgy, the best men also communed together with the newlyweds, thus participating more substantially in the mystery.

## 130

**During Great Thursday, we also excise a second lamb and reserve it for the communion of the sick throughout the year. However, when the same priest serves two parishes, how is it possible to have Body and Blood reserved also for another parish, in which he did not serve on this day?**

The reservation of the consecrated Bread from the Liturgy of Great Thursday in the artophorion of the temple takes place clearly for practical reasons, namely, its use for communion of the sick, of the dying, and so forth. This takes place during Great Thursday certainly due to the special festal character of this day, the commemoration of the Mystical Supper of the Lord. Nevertheless, not one rubric prohibits the reservation of Holy Bread also during any other Liturgy. Nor can a theoretical reason be also argued to support the opposite

point of view. All Liturgies have the same efficacy, all are celebrated in remembrance and by virtue of the Mystical Supper of the Lord and absolutely no difference exists between the consecrated Precious Gifts of Great Thursday and of any other day. Consequently, while the established taxis is the reservation of the Holy Bread of Great Thursday, in exceptional cases this can also be done in another Liturgy. Certainly, this must be done when perhaps the reserved Holy Bread is exhausted, when it is spoiled, or when for any other reason there are no sacred reserved consecrated elements in the artophorion, when for example the temple is destroyed, when a new parish is established, and so forth. Providing precisely for the case of the destruction of Great Thursday's Holy Bread, the *Sacred Anthology* of Daniēl Geōrgopoulos orders that the priest in another Liturgy "excises holy bread, as on Great Thursday, and after consecrating and drying, reserves it and communes the sick from it" (fifth edition, in Athens, 1898, p. 99).[951]

Contrariwise, again, there exists no theoretical, practical, or canonical impediment for the transport of the reserved Holy Bread to another temple. The prohibition of the transport of the Lamb of the Presanctified does not relate as such to this transport, as to the celebration of the Presanctified in a different temple from that in which the Liturgy is celebrated, and this is the case, as we wrote in an earlier response, for historical reasons and for avoidance of possible abuses.[952]

I think that the priest can act according to his judgment, consistent with the particular circumstances before which he finds himself. Namely, he can reserve Holy Bread in another parish during the Liturgy of another day, or transport to the other parish a portion from the contents of the artophorion of another temple where he served on Great Thursday or commune the sick of both

951. Δανιὴλ Γεωργόπουλος, *Ἱερὰ Ἀνθολογία: περιέχουσα ἑρμηνείαν ἐπὶ τῆς τελετῆς τῶν ἑπτὰ μυστηρίων τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας ἔτι δὲ διάφορα ἄλλα χρήσιμα καὶ ἀναγκαῖα πρὸς ὁδηγίαν τοῦ εὐαγοῦς Ἱερατείου* (Venice: Ἐκ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Τυπογραφίας Φραγκίσκου Ἀνδρεόλα, 1833; 5th ed.; Ἀθῆναι: Ν. Μιχαλόπουλος, 1898), 99.

952. See question 80.

parishes from the artophorion of the one parish, if both parishes are found in the same city.

## 131

**A local saint is celebrated festively[953] during Great Lent and has a service book[954] with a full sacred service, epistle, gospel, koinōnikon, and so forth. Can the Divine Liturgy of Chrysostomos be celebrated during his/her commemoration or not?[955]**

According to the most ancient practice of the Church, throughout all the days of Great Lent, except for Saturday and Sunday, the celebration of the Divine Liturgy and the festive celebration for the commemoration of any saint are prohibited. These days are days of fasting, mourning, and repentance, while the commemoration of saints and the Divine Liturgy, which always accompanies the celebration of a feast, have a festive, celebratory, and fast-breaking character. Two canons of the Council in Laodicea (around 360) formalize this practice: canon forty-nine, which forbids the celebration of the Divine Liturgy during the weekdays of Great Lent ("that it is not permitted to offer bread during Lent, except on Saturday and Sunday alone")[956] and canon fifty-one, which prescribes the transfer of the commemoration of the martyrs to Saturdays and Sundays of Great Lent ("that it is not permitted during Lent to celebrate birthdays of martyrs, but to perform commemorations of the holy martyrs on Saturdays and Sundays").[957] If anyone examines the Heortologion for the period of the immovable liturgical year, which may fall during periods of fasting, he will not see commemorations of great saints with a full celebratory service, not because during this

953. The word "πανηγυρικῶς" is translated here "festively" and implies all of the elements mentioned in the question, such as a complete Liturgy as well as an Artoklasia. This type of celebration is distinguished from a simple "commemoration" (μνήμη).

954. "φυλλάδα."

955. See also questions 154, 173, 174, 279, 295, 341, 342, 343, 369, 404, 421, 560, and 595.

956. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 3:216.

957. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 3:218.

time period prominent saints did not happen to be martyred or die, but because the mourning period of Lent did not encourage the growth of their honor, or their commemoration was transferred to the Saturdays and Sundays of Lent or even after Pascha. In this way, we have the commemoration of Iōannēs author of the Ladder on the Fourth Sunday of the Fast, Blessed Maria of Egypt on the Fifth, and Saint Theodōros of Tyre on the Saturday of the First week of the Fast, whose commemorations are marked respectively on March 30, April 1, and February 17. Perhaps also the feast of the Veneration of the Cross on the Third Sunday of the Fast was derived from a transfer of the feast of the Finding of the Precious Cross (March 6). The feast of the Annunciation alone presents an exception, which is not transferred according to the old Typika even if it might also fall on Great Friday and this is the case because the conception of the Lord must be celebrated exactly nine months before His Nativity (December 25); otherwise, according to the precise understanding of that time period, a danger would exist of it being considered as a violation of the doctrine of the perfect Incarnation of the Lord, since His gestation by the most holy Theotokos would be represented as imperfect even for a few days. The commemoration of the Holy Forty and of Saint Charalampos remained as an exception, according to which, if they fall during the weekdays of Lent, the Liturgy of the Presanctified is celebrated.

Therefore, consistent with all these things, although the service book of the local saint has a full service, under no circumstances is the celebration of the Liturgy of Chrysostomos permitted on the day of his/her commemoration, if it does not fall on Saturday or Sunday. Consistent with the practice that we have referenced and the canon of the Council in Laodicea, the more correct thing would be that his/her commemoration be transferred preferably to the nearest Saturday, since the Sundays of Lent already have their own festal subjects that conform to the entire framework of the Fast, or better yet to one of the days of Renewal Week, as happens with the feast of Saint Geōrgios and of the evangelist Mark. In the latter case, the taxis of Lent and its entire penitential character would not be disturbed and the celebration of the feast of the saint

would be found in the suitable festal atmosphere of Pascha. However, it is needless for me to write that the transfer of the saint's feast is outside of the priest's authority. It is a subject for the bishop and the Holy Synod.

If the transfer is not judged appropriate for the commemoration of the saint, provided that it does not fall on Saturday or Sunday, the Liturgy of the Presanctified would be celebrated, like also for the commemoration of the Holy Forty. The standard rubric, which is found for their commemoration on March 9 would also constitute the guide for laying out the saint's service. Namely, the service of Vespers and Matins would be interwoven with the service of the Triōdion, with the doxastika of the saint, the gospel of the Matins, and the great doxology. The apolytikion and kontakion of the saint would be said in the Hours. In the Liturgy of the Presanctified of the day of the feast, the saint's troparia of Vespers would be chanted (again interwoven with the Triōdion's troparia), the doxastikon of the saint would be chanted, the entrance would take place with the Gospel book, the epistle and gospel of the saint would be read after "Let my prayer be set forth,"[958] and, finally, instead of "Taste and see . . . ,"[959] namely the koinōnikon of the Presanctified, the koinōnikon of the saint would be chanted.

We wrote extensively regarding the transport of the Presanctified Gifts in a response to a related question (eighty). The transport of the Holy Bread for a celebration of the Presanctified is prohibited.

958. "Κατευθυνθήτω."
959. "Γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε . . ."

## 132

**Our Church's canons state that if a Christian has not attended church for three consecutive Sundays, he/she must not be communed. Is it permitted for someone to be communed who is about to die and has not attended church for many years?**

## 133

**Some parishioners have not attended church or partaken of communion for many years; should they be interred within the burial ground?**[960]

Indeed, canon eighty of the Council in Trullo and canon eleven of the Council in Sardica order the layperson to "be removed" (ἀποκινῆται) from communion, who does not attend church for three Sundays in succession, with the exception of a grave need.[961] Although these canons continue to be in force, nevertheless in practice they are not applied. At least in our times, the Church has never imposed the penalty of exclusion from ecclesiastical communion on people who violated or are violating these canons. This is done because the Church over time moderated her austerity, either because also theoretically it adopts a more moderate policy over sinning Christians, since this is perhaps the most effective one and thereby the loss is less than the expected gain, or because circumstances require it to act with moderation.

Namely, if today based on the criterion of "church attendance," Christians not attending Church for three Sundays in succession were excluded from ecclesiastical communion, half of the faithful theoretically belonging to the Church, if not even more, would have to be excommunicated from it. The relevant statistics, which have been established by many, no matter how exaggerated they are considered, do not at all appear encouraging. Faced with this reality, the Church, without ever ceasing to preach and to urge by any means Christians to attend church regularly and to recall the penalties that

960. In Greece, public cemeteries are generally regarded as sacred grounds, often where a chapel is located, and interments in them are administered by the state and the Orthodox Church.

961. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:489; 3:259.

the relevant canons impose, prefers not to impose strictness, but by oikonomia prefers to tolerate her "inactive" (μὴ ἐνεργά) members—to use a lenient characterization—with the hope that perhaps one day the grace of God may work even in the hearts of these people and guide them in the way of His will.

The Church especially did not deny communion on the deathbed, even during the times of great austerity, as a last act of reconciliation and effort for salvation of its sick member.

The same thing precisely also applies to the burial of these "inactive" members of the Church according to the church Typikon and in sacred burial grounds. Given that the baptized Christian has not been formally separated from the Church or that the Church by her practice has not cut him/her off from her body, it is inconceivable that we would deprive him/her also of these last cares, which are reserved posthumously for the faithful. If a different tactic was applied, very few would have the privilege of this ecclesiastical burial.

## 134

**When newlyweds plant fruit trees or vineyards during the same year as their marriage, they do not bear fruit. Is this true?**

In many places, the superstition exists that newlyweds do not plant trees during the first year of their marriage. They justify it in many ways. Either because opening the hole for the tree's planting recalls the opening of their graves, or because a danger exists that they give their fertility to the trees and they remain baren, or even the opposite, that the trees being planted by them do not bear fruit, since fecundity is not left over, as it were, also for the trees, because the newlyweds keep it all for themselves.

This superstition is based on the age-old idea that the individual who plants something also imparts his/her properties to it, or that when making something he/she can influence its future in a similar conveying manner.

There would not be, perhaps, a need for us to write that this is a case of a naive mindset, foreign to the Christian faith. The

lack of this faith makes humanity a slave of often ridiculous superstitions, which will vanish only if our Christians in name will become consciously faithful.

## 135

**How must the drying of the Holy Bread of Great Thursday be done? Should not a special vessel and special service exist, so that the task is done with solemnity?**

No sacred rite is provided for the drying of the Holy Bread, which is reserved for the Church's emergency needs. The only ritual elements preserved by tradition are the priest vesting himself fully, the unfolding of the antiminsion, the censing of the holy table, the reverences, and the fraction of the Holy Bread with the holy lance. A brazier of common or handy construction is used especially for the drying. The *Sacred Anthology* of the sacred teacher (ἱεροδιδάσκαλος) Daniël Geōrgopoulos (fifth edition, in Athens, 1898, p. 100), concerning which we also discussed on another occasion, describes the relevant tradition. I quote the relevant detailed rubric: "After the end of the Liturgy, he [the priest] unfolds the antiminsion on the holy table and emptying [the Holy Bread] from the artophorion he puts it on the paten, incenses around, and after piously reverencing breaks it with the holy lance into small parts with piety and fear. After this, he places a stool on the right side of the holy table, a brick or stone on the stool, and a clean bronze or iron vessel filled with lit coals on this brick, and after reverencing piously, he takes the holy paten, which is not made from tin, with great care and places it on the vessel, in which there are the coals, while taking care that the parts dry gradually also turning them with the holy lance, and taking care that they are not burned. After the paten has been well warmed, he takes it down and places it upon the holy antiminsion or on the coverings, taking care that they are not overheated and do not burn. When the particles cool off, he places the paten on the fire a second time, and doing this several times until they are well dried, then he places them into the artophorion, places the artophorion in its place

while making a prostration piously, and folds the antiminsion."[962] This way of drying appears somewhat outdated. The priest, whose temple has modern electrical appliances, can certainly use them also in this case or, according to to his judgment, improve what has been handed down. I know very pious priests who have already implemented these things.

Where the attention of our priests must be turned is for the drying to take place fully and, if possible, on the same day or the next day at the latest, in order that the chance spoilage of the Holy Bread is avoided and that its fraction is easier. It is unnecessary to repeat that all these things must be done with the greatest piety and immense care. The existence of a special service is not necessary both because it is not attested to by tradition, and because it is replaced by the priest's own unceasing entreaty at that hour, that while performing this awe-inspiring task he shall find himself firmly in a state of concentration and noetic prayer.

## 136

**On the day of Theophany, when a baptism of an infant happens to take place, is the water blessed, given that on this day the Great Hagiasmos was read, and the waters are blessed?**

As we also wrote in the response to question 126, the Great Hagiasmos, which is done on the eve and on the day of the feast of Lights, is celebrated in remembrance of the Baptism of the Lord and is precisely the blessing of the waters of holy baptism, from which the faithful drew and in which afterwards the catechumens were baptized. Consequently, baptism in this water is historically and theoretically justified. Both nowadays and earlier by unwritten tradition in many places, when a baptism is celebrated on the day of Theophany, a special sanctification of the water does not take place, but Great Hagiasmos is thrown into the water of the baptismal font and

962. Δανιὴλ Γεωργόπουλος, *Ἱερὰ Ἀνθολογία: περιέχουσα ἑρμηνείαν ἐπὶ τῆς τελετῆς τῶν ἑπτὰ μυστηρίων τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας ἔτι δὲ διάφορα ἄλλα χρήσιμα καὶ ἀναγκαῖα πρὸς ὁδηγίαν τοῦ εὐαγοῦς Ἱερατείου* (Venice: Ἐκ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Τυπογραφίας Φραγκίσκου Ἀνδρεόλα, 1833; 5th ed.; Ἀθῆναι: Ν. Μιχαλόπουλος, 1898), 100.

the service is continued from the blessing of the oil of exorcism.[963] In this case, the five or six petitions, which are referring to the sanctification of the water ("That this water may be sanctified . . ."[964] up until "That this water may prove effectual . . ."[965] or even "That he/she that is about to be baptized . . ."[966]), and the prayer of the water's sanctification ("Great are you, O Lord . . ."[967] up until "whose names are written in heaven, in you our God . . . Amen"[968]) must be omitted from the entire service.

However, we should necessarily emphasize that Great Hagiasmos must be used because baptism is not permitted to take place in common water. The general and poetic expressions, "Today the nature of the waters is sanctified . . ."[969] and so forth, do not mean that all waters on the day of the feast of Lights are sanctified and have the efficacy and grace of Great Hagiasmos. These expressions are referring to the purification of the water's nature during the Baptism of the Lord, like His Crucifixion on the wood of the cross is characterized as sanctifying the nature of woods and His Incarnation as purifying the nature of humanity. Otherwise, there would be no need of celebrating and partaking of Great Hagiasmos if all waters were holy.

## 137

**Is it permitted for the priest to celebrate the mystery of marriage for two pairs of newlyweds at the same time?**

963. See question 222 for a discussion of the "oil of exorcism" (τὸ ἐπορκιστὸν ἔλαιον).

964. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγιασθῆναι . . ."

965. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀναδειχθῆναι . . ."

966. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἄξιον γενέσθαι . . ."

967. "Μέγας εἶ Κύριε . . ."

968. "τοῖς ἀπογεγραμμένοις ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐν σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ . . . Ἀμήν."

969. "Σήμερον τῶν ὑδάτων ἁγιάζεται ἡ φύσις . . ."

## 138

**Is it permitted in one and the same service of marriage for two or more couples to be crowned, or must the marriages be performed separately? Otherwise, why are the priests of Athens, who have many crownings, not doing them two at a time or three at a time, but are inconveniencing the intending spouses until even late at night?**[970]

The service of marriage, and of betrothal, as it is presented nowadays in our Euchologia and as attested to by the entire manuscript tradition, presuppose, both in the texts of the prayers and in the standard rubrics, the presence of only one pair of newlyweds. The same things are also laid out in this way for other ecclesiastical services, such as holy baptism, the funeral, and even unction, so that they are directed to only one believer. In spite of this, all these services can also be celebrated for many at the same time.

Precisely, also, the service of marriage can be celebrated at the same time for many couples, since, obviously, what is found in the prayers that is in the singular will be rearranged in the plural and in each case, the prayers are mentioning the names of the newlyweds by couple. The exchange of the rings, the joining of the hands, and the crowning will take place separately for each couple and the relevant words that accompany the betrothal and the crowning will be recited specifically for each one. And nowadays, in many places, marriages are celebrated jointly, often of siblings, but also of other persons, by priests and hierarchs in the manner that we have mentioned above.

It would certainly be advisable that joint weddings of such a type take place for many reasons. And firstly, it would avoid what the second question implies, namely, the hasty celebration in certain temples of large cities of a whole series of weddings in a manner many times less solemn and even tiresome for the priests themselves. Secondly, there will not be a more beautiful manner for the brother-

970. In major cities, such as Athens, especially in the summer months, Saturdays are popular for weddings. Due to the size of the parishes, there can be a number of wedding ceremonies celebrated one after the other. This can result in chaos between ceremonies, hurried celebrations, and fatigue on the part of the celebrants.

hood in Christ of the faithful and the members of one ecclesiastical community to be represented and to be emphasized, when the new Christian couples, who are about to be married on the same day, meet together at the temple with their parents, relations, and friends to celebrate marriages and to pray together for the union in Christ and the formation of the parish's new families in one common celebratory gathering. The overcoming of certain simpleminded superstitions will perhaps present difficulties. The vanity of certain intended spouses and their relatives will put more obstacles in the way. But, I think, that it is worthwhile making such an effort. It will produce many remarkable fruits.

## 139

**Some additional information regarding the blessing of the antidōron.**

We publish below a letter that was sent by the professor of Liturgy, Fr. Valentim Van Gool, from Fatima, Portugal,[971] with regard to the response to question 109. It is interesting because he gives us certain additional information concerning the blessing of the antidōron. There we saw what meaning the elevation of the antidōron has, how this practice was misunderstood, and consequently how the blessing by the hand of the priest was introduced, without, however, any prayer being offered. In the Romanian Church, development also progressed to this point. The letter is written in Greek.

". . . I would also want to give you information with regard to question 109 (antidōron) from the last published edition of the Hieratikon of the Orthodox Church of Romania (Bucharest 1956): 'Before the end of the chant ["It is truly meet . . ."][972] he makes the sign of the cross with the tray that contains the offering [namely, the antidōron, the prosphora] opposite the Holy Mysteries and touching it to the holy paten and holy chalice, he says, a prayer of

971. Valentim Van Gool, O.P., at the time of this writing appears to have been the ecclesiarch of Byzantine chapel of the Dormition located at Domus Pacis, the international headquarters of the Blue Army of Our Lady of Fatima, (*Voz da Fatima*, March 13, 1965, 3).

972. "Ἄξιόν ἐστιν . . ."

the anaphora: 'Through the intercessions of your All Holy Mother, Lord Jesus Christ, bless this bread, which shall be given instead of your Holy Mysteries, now and ever . . . .' This prayer is obviously later and likely to give rise to a misunderstanding that presents the antidōron as a mere replacement of Holy Communion."

## 140

**If a priest is called upon to do a Trisagion for a deceased, when entering into the home of the deceased, does he immediately begin with "Blessed"[973] or is there some tradition of reciting a saying from Holy Scripture or Sacred Tradition?**

According to the printed liturgical books, nothing precedes the funereal Trisagion, which is chanted in the deceased's house before the receiving of the remains.[974] Although the manuscripts present a large number of variations, they (some of them name this service "Thanksgiving"[975]) agree with the printed editions on this point. In a few, "[the priests] take kairos" precedes. And Symeōn of Thessaloniki, although he describes the funeral service in detail, does not attest to anything relevant (*Dialogue*, chapter 361).[976] I do not know if such a custom was preserved anywhere by an unwritten liturgical tradition.

---

973. "εὐλογητόν." This refers to the enarxis of the service of the Trisagion, "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ." (Blessed is our God . . .). The question is whether the priest begins the service immediately or reads something from Holy Scripture or Sacred Tradition, such as a saying of the Fathers.

974. Namely, before the body is removed from the home, either for the funeral service in the temple or, in modern times, for preparation. According to older village customs in Greece, if a person died in the early morning or overnight, the funeral was generally in the afternoon. However, if the death occurred in the afternoon or early evening, the body would be displayed in the home of the deceased until its burial the next morning. The older custom was to bury the deceased within twenty-four hours. For a study of such practices, see Loring M. Danforth, *The Death Rituals of Rural Greece* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982). See also the discussions in question seven regarding the conducting of services in cemeteries, question fifty-nine on prayers of absolution, and question ninety-seven on exhumation and the meaning of decomposition.

975. "Εὐχαριστία."

976. PG 155:680d–686a.

The question does not tell us what these verses are. They are likely to be comforting words to the relatives of the dead or a type of absolution directed to the one who has "fallen asleep" or, finally, they may be related to the offering of incense or even to the vesting of the priests. In any event, this is a case of a peculiarity of local tradition.

## 141

**When the priest exclaims, "Blessed is the Kingdom . . ."[977] at the enarxis of the service of marriage, in which direction must he look and make the sign of the cross with the Gospel book, over the table or on the heads of the newlyweds?**

As an opportunity was given us at another time to also write, the service of marriage was always celebrated together with the Divine Liturgy. Nowadays, we discern the remnants of this connection: the litany of peace, the readings, the ektenēs, the petitions, the common cup (which replaced holy communion), the koinōnikon "I will take the cup of salvation . . . ,"[978] as well as the enarxis with "Blessed is the Kingdom . . . ," to which also the question refers. The newlyweds stood before the beautiful gate, and the priest, given that he was about to celebrate the Liturgy, said the exclamation of the enarxis in the customary manner before the holy table, on which the crowns were also found. Even if holy Presanctified Elements were offered to the newlyweds, the chalice that contained them was again found on the holy table, and later when the common cup was introduced and was also set upon the holy table, the enarxis of the service continued to take place from the altar, even after the separation from the Divine Liturgy.

When finally, the connection of marriage and Liturgy ceased, the newlyweds did not stand "before the doors of the sanctuary" (according to the manuscripts) or "opposite" or "before the altar" (according to Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Dialogue*, chapters 278–279)[979] and the priests not "within the altar," but in the middle of the temple, obviously in order to have convenient space. The small

977. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία . . ."
978. "Ποτήριον σωτηρίου λήψομαι . . ."
979. PG 155:508a–509a.

table was then also appointed in replacement of the holy table, upon which was transferred what was formerly placed on the holy table, namely, the Gospel book, the crowns, and the common cup. Consequently, "Blessed is the Kingdom . . . ," which was preserved from the Divine Liturgy, must be said over the replacement, so to speak, for the holy altar, as it was said formerly over the holy table itself. According to codex 664 of the National Library of Athens, which presupposes this new practice, the standard rubric, "And turning [the priest] to the East he says . . . ," precedes the exclamation, "Blessed is the Kingdom . . . ." The priest stood before the newlyweds, who looked, as also nowadays, towards the East. Consequently, when he said, "Blessed is the Kingdom . . . ," the priest turned his back toward them, namely he said it over the table, which was in the middle of the temple.

The saying of "Blessed is the Kingdom . . ." over the heads of the intended spouses obviously originated from a misunderstanding. The Gospel book was offered to them for kissing. A blessing in the shape of the cross with the Gospel book was also perhaps associated with the kissing. Since the enarxis of the Liturgy and of the service of marriage already had this movement of the Gospel book in the shape of a cross on the holy table, it was easy for a confusion of these two different practices to result, and for "Blessed is the kingdom . . ." with the movement of the Gospel book in the shape of a cross to be transferred to the heads of the newlyweds, in at least some localities, a thing that does not take place in any other service.

## 142

**During the great entrance, how must we take and hold the precious gifts, namely, with which hand do we hold the paten and with which the holy chalice? If we take them as in the prothesis, when turning to the people the right is reversed left and the left right. Must not they appear to the people as also to us?**

I think that this concerns a topic, which does not require great officiousness. In the holy prothesis, the paten is found to the right of the chalice, but to the left of the priest. In the entrance, again, when

a deacon also concelebrates, the paten precedes, but it is held by the deacon. The same thing is the case also for their placement on the holy table, of the paten to be to the right of the chalice, but to the left of the priest, the opposite for the chalice. However, why was a special prestigious distinction sought for the contents of the paten? Both the paten and chalice contain the "antitypes," according to the expression of the prayer of the anaphora of Basileios the Great, of the Precious Body and Blood of the Lord and, after consecration, the very Body and Blood of Christ, namely, species equal in honor, both before and after the consecration. Only in the Liturgy of the Presanctified would such a subject arise, since the paten contains the Presanctified Precious Gifts, while the chalice, before the commixture, unconsecrated wine and water. Despite this, their ordinary traditional position is maintained even during this Liturgy. The same thing is also the case during the Liturgy after the communion of the priest and the transfer of the Holy Body into the chalice, despite the fact that the paten is empty, it continues to remain to the right of the chalice.

Perhaps, more practical reasons determined the position of the precious gifts and the manner in which the vessels are held during the entrance. Namely, the paten, especially when it does not have the later base, but preserves the ancient form of the paten, in order to be transported securely requires also the right hand's contribution in order for the paten and its coverings to be steady in the hand holding it. In contrast, the chalice always had and has a base and its holding and transport do not present any special difficulty.

I do not see the fact that the people view the holy vessels in an inverted position during the entrance to present anything improper.

## 143

**When the priest is serving Liturgy and is called upon for someone to receive communion who is in danger of dying, what must he do?**

On this serious subject, the priest must have two things in mind. First, his sacred work and inviolable duty is to rush to the one dying,

to offer him/her the Church's consolation and support, and to provide the last provision, the Lord's Body and Blood, for remission of sins and for life eternal. Second, that for no reason is the interruption of the Divine Liturgy permitted from the great entrance and above all from the beginning of the prayer of the holy anaphora. During the early period, the custom existed for the Holy Eucharist to be transported in a case of extraordinary need even by a layperson. However, nowadays, this is not permitted. Now, if any such circumstance befalls the priest, if he finds himself at the part of the Divine Liturgy before the great entrance, he can exercise oikonomia regarding matters according to his judgment, hurrying to the sick one and returning quickly in order to continue the Divine Liturgy. However, if he was called upon after the great entrance, there exists no other solution than somehow speeding up the pace of the Liturgy's celebration to hurry immediately afterwards to the side of the one dying. In addition, regarding this part of the Liturgy, when long chants are avoided and the distribution of the antidōron is omitted, this may amount even to a half hours' time.

The *Sacred Anthology* of Daniël Geōrgopoulos, although it does not have canonical authority, can also serve as a guide for the priest on this point. I quote the relevant passage: "After the priest begins the Liturgy, if a great life-threatening need follows, either to baptize or to confess, during the proskomidē or during the Liturgy up until the great entrance, and he does not have time to complete the Liturgy, he marks where he left off and hurries quickly there and after he completes the hope of salvation for the one sick at the hour of death, returning he begins from the place marked and completes the Liturgy; in what time he is absent, he may appoint a reading in an ecclesiastical book to be done. If he is delayed for a long time there, and time has passed, if this is before the cheroubikon, he quits the Liturgy, but the next day serving the Liturgy from the beginning, after communion, he also consumes[980] the gifts from the previous

980. The use of the verb συστέλλει translated normally as "he consumes" with regard to the eucharistic elements here also appears to imply that the priest will gather (implied by the additional meaning of συστέλλει that "he gathers together") and place the unconsecrated gifts from the day before into

day, as we have said. But if this is after the Cherubic hymn, while keeping the Lord's will in mind for the one sick, he does not quit the Liturgy" (fifth edition, in Athens 1898, pp. 93–94).[981]

## 144

**In our region, the custom is established on the Saturday that precedes a memorial service, which is celebrated on Sunday, for a concelebration to take place, in which priests are invited from neighboring villages. In the event that those priests are prevented from coming, shall the concelebration[982] be performed only by the priest of the village or shall it be delayed even though everything is prepared for it? Why is this called "concelebration"[983] and why is it celebrated on Saturday?**

Consistent with the ancient practice of the Church, memorial services for those who have fallen asleep were always celebrated on Saturday, a day specifically dedicated to the dead, as we also see from the funereal canons and the other hymns that the Saturday services of the Paraklētikē contain. The transfer of the memorial services to Sunday took place by oikonomia, due to special needs that the faithful encountered in daily life, where they could not abandon their occupations and professions on Saturday and come to the temple in order to pray for the repose of the soul for the one who has "fallen asleep." This transfer did not take place without resistance and fierce disputes, which for many years during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries disturbed the Church.[984] Finally, it became es-

---

the chalice after the communion, so that all will be consumed after the service according to ordinary practice.

981. Δανιὴλ Γεωργόπουλος, *Ἱερὰ Ἀνθολογία: περιέχουσα ἑρμηνείαν ἐπὶ τῆς τελετῆς τῶν ἑπτὰ μυστηρίων τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας ἔτι δὲ διάφορα ἄλλα χρήσιμα καὶ ἀναγκαῖα πρὸς ὁδηγίαν τοῦ εὐαγοῦς Ἱερατείου* (Venice: Ἐκ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Τυπογραφίας Φραγκίσκου Ἀνδρεόλα, 1833; 5th ed.; Ἀθῆναι: Ν. Μιχαλόπουλος, 1898), 93–94.

982. "συλλείτουργο."

983. "συλλείτουργο."

984. The theological controversy marking the last half of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was complex and involved, among other elements: a major theological dispute over the proper day to celebrate memorial services, a baptism controversy over the reception of Catholics and Protestants into

tablished for memorial services to also be celebrated on Sunday, but in many places, a duplicate practice was preserved, namely for the memorial service to be celebrated two times, informally on Saturday and more formally the next day on Sunday in order for the faithful to attend who honor the memory of the deceased; or for a weak remnant of the memorial service of Saturday to still be preserved, namely, the offering of a tray with kollyba during the Vespers of Saturday in order that a Trisagion be read.[985]

The memorial service necessarily included the celebration of the Divine Liturgy for the repose of the soul of the one who has "fallen asleep," which is also the main part of the memorial service, and after it they read a Trisagion over the tray of kollyba or even the grave of the deceased. During these prayers for their dead, pious Christians not only desire that as many priests as possible are present to serve together (concelebration) and to pray jointly for the repose of his/her soul, but, if possible, even a hierarch to officiate (hierarchical memorial service). In the localities where the memorial service of Saturday was preserved, during it, the concelebration of priests

Orthodoxy, struggles over the frequency of communion, questions of church order, the advancement of spiritual and monastic renewal, the questioning of synodal and hierarchical decisions, and the validity of excommunications. An excellent overview of this complex period is provided by Socrates D. Petmezas, "On the formation of an ideological faction in the Greek Orthodox Church in the second half of the eighteenth century: the *Kollybades*" (paper presented at Συνέδριο, Θρησκείες καὶ Πολιτικὴ στὶς Ἀνατολὲς τῆς Εὐρώπης [14ος–20ος αἰῶνας], Thessaloniki, December 2011), https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287333830_Oi_Kollybades_e_synkrotese_enos_ideologikou_reumatos_entos_tes_Ellenorthodoxes_Ekklesias_sto_18o_aiona (accessed July 12, 2022). A defense of those eighteenth century monks of Mount Athos who had advanced the view that memorial services must not be celebrated on Sundays, and were labeled Kollybades (Κολλυβάδες) after the use of boiled wheat known as kollyba (κόλλυβα) for such services, may be found in the work of Saint Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain, *Ὁμολογία πίστεως : ἤτοι ἀπολογία δικαιότατη κατὰ τῶν, ὅσοι ἀμαθῶς καὶ κακοβούλως ἐτόλμησαν παρεξηγεῖν καὶ διαβάλλειν Παραδόσεις τινὰς τῆς Ἁγίας Ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ τῶν περὶ Πίστεως ὑγιῆ καὶ ὀρθόδοξα φρονήματα τοῦ ἀοιδίμου Διδασκάλου Νικοδήμου τοῦ Ἁγιορείτου* (Venice: Παρὰ Πάνῳ Θεοδοσίου τῷ ἐξ Ἰωαννίνων, 1819). Κολλυβάδες is also transliterated as Kollyvades.

985. In the villages, the more formal celebration involves invitations to relatives and others to travel and attend the memorial services and often to partake of a reception or even meal afterwards.

occurred because it took place originally on Saturday and because priests were not able to leave their villages during Sunday Liturgy. In other places, another solution was found; to extend the Sunday Liturgy a little for the priests of the neighboring villages to arrive and to take part, not in the Liturgy, but in the Trisagion that followed, a thing that became more prevalent.

We must not doubt that all these things have in principle a pious motive. If the entreaty of one "righteous person" is so powerful, the supplications of more numbers of righteous ones are certainly more acceptable to God. Likewise, we must not doubt that the devout love of people for their relatives and the burning desire for their salvation make them want to take advantage as much as possible of the Church's entreaties on their behalf. However, we must be frank in our judgments. All of us human beings are beset with weakness.[986] Many times, underlying all these displays of piety, very human affairs are hidden; tendencies of ostentation on the part of the faithful and, let us not hide it, narrow self-interest on the part of priests as well. The priest must stand above these things on the height of his priestly character and illumine Christians that they must celebrate what is customary for their deceased and, if they wish, concelebrations, but also that, whether by many or by one priest, the sacrifice will be same for the one who has "fallen asleep," and ostentation and splendid memorial services will not be for the benefit of his/her soul, where if they take place with this intent, the immediate effect of them will be their own spiritual injury.

If the local custom is so powerful that it is impossible for the faithful to be persuaded otherwise and they demand the performance of a concelebration for their dead, insofar as priests of the neighboring villages do not physically come, it is impossible for concelebration to take place, when also its very name presupposes the presence of more priests than one. It would then be postponed by necessity for another Saturday that would be convenient for the invited priests. However, I think that Christians will be easily con-

986. "περικείμεθα ἀσθένειαν."

vinced that their own priest officiating will have the same efficacy as a concelebration and there would not be a need to postpone.

## 145

**For those who have broken their fast for any reason during Great Lent, is the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross a day of fasting for them?**

It is well known that on Sundays, due to their Paschal character, fasting is not permitted. Apostolic canon sixty-six, canon fifty-five of the Council in Trullo, canon eighteen of the Council in Gangra, and canon fifteen of Saint Petros of Alexandria impose the penalty of defrocking on clergy and excommunication on those laity who violate the relevant ecclesiastical tradition.[987] Neither the Sundays of Great Lent, nor the eves of the Nativity and Theophany and other fasts of the ecclesiastical year that would fall on Sunday, are exempt from this canon. On all these, "breaking fast with wine and oil" takes place. Certainly, in the Typikon of Saint Sabas that is preserved in codex 628 of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem from the thirteenth century, it is expressly stated that the laity broke their fast on Saturdays and Sundays of Great Lent not only with oil, but also with fish. The Typikon of the women's Monastery of the Panagia Kecharitōmenē of Constantinople also provides the same thing for the trapeza of the monastery.[988] And the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross cannot constitute an exception. Moreover, despite the fact that it is dedicated to the Cross of Christ, it also preserves the Paschal character that characterizes all the other Sundays of the year. Nowhere in ecclesiastical tradition does a special exception take place regarding this.

However, the question refers to a certain contemporary practice that by custom is observed by many faithful. Not that a real fast is observed, namely, either abstinence from food or xerophagy, on the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross, but our Christians, who do not fast on the other Sundays (and perhaps on the fasting days of Lent), break fast only "with oil and wine" on this Sunday. In other

987. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:84, 434; 3:114; and 4:43.
988. Thomas and Hero, 2:691–693.

words, they only limited to this Sunday what they should have observed also for the others of the fasting period.[989]

Why this takes place is difficult to explain. The Veneration of the Precious Cross gives this day a special color that makes it more revered than other Sundays of Lent and places it in a similar position to Great Friday and the Exaltation of the Precious Cross. Both these days are days of austere fasting and, by their influence, the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross obviously preserved, more than the other Sundays of Lent, the ancient form of diet that was in force throughout all the Sundays of the Fast, the "breaking fast with wine and oil." Fasting, we repeat, on the basis of the Church's practice and of the canons that we mentioned, is not permitted on this Sunday.

## 146

**During a time of fasting, why do we fast from oil and fish, and eat olives and caviar?**

We have written repeatedly that early and true fasting consists in complete abstinence from food or in xerophagy. However, since this is not possible to be observed during the ecclesiastical year's long periods of fasting—neither can laypeople (who are working and toiling) fully observe the institutions of fasting, which have been formed in monasteries and have chiefly monks in view, nor still do all have the zeal and the faith to implement them—various accommodations have been devised in practice, so that as far as possible the faithful's compliance with the legislation concerning fasting might be feasible. And while in the ancient era, Christians broke fast with "bread and water" after the ninth hour (3:00 p.m.) of fasting days, gradually not only was the duration of the complete abstinence from food reduced to limits customary also on the other days—for this reason also the Vespers of Lent and

989. In other words, on this Sunday, these faithful abstain from meat and animal products, but allow themselves wine and oil, namely, they practice the standard fasting that should have been observed for every Sunday during Lent. Phountoulēs is pointing out that these faithful are not observing fasting to begin with and are giving a special prominence to this Sunday.

Presanctifieds were transferred to the morning—but also other types of foods began to be used, such as fruits, legumes, crustaceans, mollusks, and so forth.

Within this context, the eating of olives on the days when we do not eat oil and the eating of fish roe on the days when we refrain from fish can be understood. And concerning the first, we can adduce the reason that olives are eaten as a fruit, while the prohibition of olive oil has to do with foods that are prepared with the oil. Concerning the second, the justification is a little easier, since the same thing does not also apply regarding milk or eggs, but these are also prohibited during our fasting days as "fruit . . . and products, of the things from which we abstain" according to canon fifty-six of the Penthektē Ecumenical Council.[990] In any case, I know pious Christians, who are conscious by tradition of this "oikonomia" and, during the days of great fasting, as well as on the eve of their coming to holy communion, also refrain from these two types.[991]

It is true that this question, which the priest submits, we often also hear from well-intentioned faithful more frequently than others who scoff at our fasting days. In both cases, the flexibility and the philanthropy of the Church's relevant customs and canons can also be emphasized, which do not have as their aim to annihilate human beings, but to assist them as much as possible to practice self-restraint and to master their passions. If these foods scandalize them, they can also abstain from them, without, according to the Apostle (Romans 14:3) despising "the ones eating" them or "judging" the

990. The full canon reads, "Likewise, we have learnt that in the land of Armenia and in other places certain persons eat eggs and cheese on Saturdays and Sundays during holy Lent. It is resolved, therefore, that throughout all the world the Church of God should follow one order of fasting, and should abstain from all manner of meat, as well as from eggs and cheese, these being the fruit and products of the things from which we abstain. If any persons do not observe this, if they are clerics, they shall be deposed, if laymen, excommunicated." The translation is taken from George Nedungatt and Michael Featherstone, eds., *The Council in Trullo Revisited,* Kanonika 6 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1995), 137–138.

991. Olives and fish roe.

Church for its philanthropic policy.[992] The Church undertaking a struggle to clear up matters around fasting customs and the foods that are traditionally eaten according to it, neither is a current concern nor can always remain within the boundaries of seriousness. That which comes first is the emphasis on the need for fasting and on the spiritual benefit from it, on the faithful's compliance as much as possible with the relevant ecclesiastical legislation and its spiritual significance, which has quite slackened during our times.

## 147

**Many Christians call upon the priest of the parish to exchange the rings of their children. In connection with this, must the priest wear an epitrachēlion and what exactly must he say, so that the rite of betrothal does not have a character of a benediction for the engagement?**

Other priests also submitted relevant questions and quite a bit was written in the answers to questions 32 and 116. It is well known that for various moral, social, and other reasons that the benediction of the betrothal is always celebrated before the marriage and consecutively with the service of crowning. The opposite is prohibited and the priests who celebrated betrothal separately are punished according to the legislation that we noted there. However, the priest finding himself at an informal family celebration of betrothal, whether as a member of the family, or as a friend, or even as a shepherd of the parish, is not only not prohibited, but is even obligated by his priestly position as a shepherd and spiritual father of those becoming engaged. Due to this position of his, as the guest of honor and as the most sacred person of the gathering, he will be invited to "exchange" the rings. In order that the exchange of rings not take on the character of a benediction, the priest must not wear his priestly stole or read the relevant service, which is contained in the Euchologion.

---

992. Romans 14:3 reads, "Let not him who eats despise him who abstains and let not him who abstains pass judgment on him who eats; for God has welcomed him" (RSV).

I know many priests who apply the following "Typikon:" They chant an apolytikion, such as that of the saint, of the parish, of the day, of the feast, or of the Theotokos, "make the sign of the cross" with the rings on an icon, and put them on the engaged while saying, "In the name of the Father . . . ." Obviously, they do not wear the epitrachēlion. In this way, both the Church's presence is excluded, and a benediction is not performed.

## 148

**Is holy unction read for babies and unbaptized children?**

All mysteries of the Church are only performed for baptized Christians. Unbaptized children, although they have been born from Christian parents, dedicated to God, received into the temple, blessed during the various prebaptismal services, and can be characterized as "catechumens" in some way, nevertheless, since they have not yet received holy baptism and have not formally entered into the Church by it, they cannot also partake of the various mysteries, which are intended only for the faithful.

If again the child is baptized, even if he/she is an infant, he/she can partake of the sanctification of unction. Certainly, when he/she is sick, this mystery can be performed especially for this reason. Of course, in the prayers, there is mention of the remission of sins, which the infant lacks, but the service of unction chiefly has the healing of bodily ills in view according to the well-known passage of Saint James (Iakōvos): "Is any among you sick? . . . and the prayer of faith will save the sick man" (Jas 5:14–15).

## 149

**On those feasts where "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ"[993] is chanted, does the priest read the same thing or the customary "Holy God . . ."[994]?**

I do not know any relevant rubric that exists either in printed liturgical books or, much more so, in manuscripts. That which tradition-

993. "Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε . . ."
994. "Ἅγιος ὁ Θεός . . ."

ally is observed both by secular priests[995] and in the monasteries is for the hymn to be repeated that the Typikon provides to be chanted by the choir, namely, the trisagion or "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ . . ."[996] or "Your cross we worship . . . ,"[997] depending on the occasion. And this is logically correct. The priest while reciting the trisagion, or the hymns that are chanted instead of it, does not do anything different than from the choir, but, because at the time of the chanting he is occupied with the reading of the prayer, in a certain sense he comes to make up for his non-participation in the chanting by privately also reciting the hymn that was chanted.

For the same reasons also, according to modern rubrics, the recitation of the Cherubic hymn is done three times by the priest and the deacon shortly before the entrance of the holy gifts. The relevant rubrics are useful to us because by analogy they also apply for the trisagion as well. As is well known, other troparia are chanted instead of the cheroubikon on certain days, namely, "Of your mystical supper . . ."[998] on Great Thursday, "Let all mortal flesh keep silent . . ."[999] on Great Saturday, and "Now the powers of the heavens . . ."[1000] during the Presanctifieds. Also according to the prevailing practice here, the priest says the troparion that is chanted instead of the cheroubikon on days when it is not said. Particularly for "Now the powers of the heavens . . . ,"[1001] aside from oral tradition, we also have the witness of manuscripts and printed editions,

995. The term "secular priest" (κοσμικὸς ἱερεύς) denotes parish clergy as opposed to hieromonks, compare a similar use of the term "λαϊκὸς ἱερεύς" in the canonical terminology of Theodōros Balsamōn in his commentary on the *Nomokanōn in Fourteen Titles* (Rhallēs and Potlēs, 1:41) and in question 22 of the sixty-six canonical questions attributed to his authorship (Rhallēs and Potlēs, 4:465). For a translation and study of these questions, see Patrick Viscuso, *Guide for a Church under Islām: The Sixty-Six Canonical Questions Attributed to Theodōros Balsamōn* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2014).

996. "Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε . . ."

997. "Τὸν σταυρόν σου . . ." The full text of the hymn is, "Τὸν σταυρόν σου προσκυνοῦμεν Δέσποτα, καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν σου Ἀνάστασιν δοξάζομεν."

998. "Τοῦ δείπνου σου τοῦ μυστικοῦ . . ."

999. "Σιγησάτω πᾶσα σὰρξ βροτεία . . ."

1000. "Νῦν αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν . . ."

1001. "Νῦν αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν . . ."

which note, that "the priest and the deacon also themselves recite, 'Now the powers,' before the holy table and make three prostrations" (*Codices National Library of Athens 751, 765,* and *775*).

## 150

**A feast of the Lord or the Mother of God often coincides on Sunday. On the feast, is "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ."[1002] inaudibly said at the moment when the Cherubic hymn is chanted or is "O come, let us worship . . ."[1003] said? In these instances, does the entrance with the Gospel book take place with the Resurrection or Crucifixion side forward?**

As we also wrote in response to question 101, "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ." is encountered only in later codices and printed editions and is appointed to be said on Sundays before the Fiftieth Psalm during the chanting of the Cherubic hymn. "O come, let us worship . . . ," at least as far as I know, is not attested to by any codex, but its recitation is provided for by modern Hieratika in place of "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ." if the Liturgy is not celebrated on a Sunday. According to older manuscripts, a triple prostration by the priest and the deacon before the holy table also preceded the Fiftieth Psalm (*National Library of Athens 759, 765,* and *771*). In a certain sense, the recitation of "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ." on resurrectional days and "O come, let us worship . . ." on the remaining ones is an embellishment of this triple prostration. Both are exhortations for a triple prostration, while the first, a veneration of Christ resurrected (note the triple repetition of the verb: let us venerate . . . we venerate . . . let us venerate),[1004] the other vaguely of Christ the king. These things supplement what was written there.

It is to be expected that manuscripts, so sparse in relevant guidance, do not elaborate concerning the individual instances, to which the questioner refers. However, based on the principle that is established there, the correct solution to the difficulties

1002. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι . . ."
1003. "Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν . . ."
1004. "προσκυνήσωμεν . . . προσκυνοῦμεν . . . προσκυνήσωμεν."

presented can be given. Namely, insofar as a Sunday preserves its resurrectional character—in other words, a great feast of the Lord does not coincide during which resurrectional troparia are not chanted—"Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . .' would be said, and conversely. For example, during the Nativity, Theophany, Palm Sunday, and Pentecost, "O come, let us worship . . ." would be said, even if the first two feasts coincide with a Sunday. On the Circumcision, the Meeting of Christ, the Annunciation as well as throughout all the feasts of the Mother of God, if they coincide with a Sunday, the "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . . ." The feast of the Resurrection of Lazaros, the Ascension, and the Exaltation of the Precious Cross present a greater difficulty. Since these three feasts also preserve a certain resurrectional character and "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ." is said during Matins, I think that it is correct to say the same also during the Cherubic hymn.

As to the position of the Gospel book on the holy table as well as during the entrance, ancient tradition does not have anything to teach us since the taxis is relatively very late for the Crucifixion to be represented on the front cover of the Gospel and the Resurrection on the back. The present representations do not exist on the covers of manuscripts, or older printed Evangelistaria. However, whatever applies to "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ." during the cheroubikon must also apply to the cases that this question is referencing.

A particular difficulty would be noted only for the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, during which while "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ." is said during the Matins, the Cross of the Lord is celebrated as a feast and the gospel reading refers to the Crucifixion. On the Holy Mountain, during this day, the Gospel book is placed and carried in the entrance with the Crucifixion facing front. Certainly, this is also more correct.

We could briefly summarize all of the above, both regarding "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ." at the Cherubic hymn and the position of the Gospel book, in the brief comment below: If "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ." is said in

the Matins, it should be said by analogy also during the cheroubikon and the Gospel book should be placed with the Resurrection upwards, with the exception only of the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross. The standard rubrics wisely prescribe the relevant point for the service of Matins.

*Answers to Liturgical Questions by Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs: A Complete and Annotated Translation*
Volume 1, Questions 1–150

*The Liturgiologist Professor I. M. Phountoulēs: His Personality and Work* by Panagiotēs I. Skaltsēs.
General Editor and Translator—Patrick Viscuso
Associate Editors and Translators—John Margetis, Anton Vrame
Contributors—Patrick Viscuso, John Margetis, Dionysios Papiris, and Andreas Houpos

*Answers to Liturgical Questions by Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs: A Complete and Annotated Translation*
Volume 2, Questions 151–300
General Editor and Translator—Patrick Viscuso
Associate Editors and Translator—John Margetis, Anton Vrame
Contributor—Patrick O'Grady and Andreas Houpos

*Answers to Liturgical Questions by Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs: A Complete and Annotated Translation*
Volume 3, Questions 301–400
General Editor and Translator—Patrick Viscuso
Associate Editors and Translators—John Margetis, Anton Vrame
Contributors—Andreas Houpos and Peter Chamberas

*Answers to Liturgical Questions by Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs: A Complete and Annotated Translation*
Volume 4, Questions 401–500
General Editor and Translator—Patrick Viscuso
Associate Editors and Translators—John Margetis, Anton Vrame
Contributors—Patrick Viscuso, John Margetis, and Stelyios Muksuris

*Answers to Liturgical Questions by Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs: A Complete and Annotated Translation*
Volume 5, Questions 501–600
General Editor and Translator—Patrick Viscuso
Associate Editors and Translators—John Margetis, Anton Vrame
Contributors—Patrick Viscuso, John Margetis

*Answers to Liturgical Questions by Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs: A Complete and Annotated Translation*
Volume 6, Glossary and Index
General Editor and Translator—Patrick Viscuso
Associate Editors and Translators—John Margetis, Anton Vrame
Contributors—Patrick Viscuso, John Margetis, Anton Vrame, Erika Zabinski, and Stefanos Alexopoulos